

JPRS-TAC-85-021

30 July 1985

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

30 July 1985

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

GENERAL

Soviet Spokesman: Arms Moratoria Could Help East-West Ties (Moscow TASS, 3 Jul 85; Bratislava Domestic Service, 5 Jul 85)	1
Briefing at Foreign Ministry	1
Interview on CSSR Radio	2
Weekly Moscow Radio Talk Show Views Arms Issues (Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobysh; Moscow Domestic Service, 7 Jul 85)	4
Gorbachev Visit to France	5
U.S.-USSR Summit Meeting	6
Bush West Europe Visit	7
FRG Bundestag Discusses Deterrent Policy, NATO (Hamburg DPA, 13 Jun 85)	9
Swedish Defense Minister Discusses Heightened Soviet Threat (Anders Sjaastad Interview; Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET, 9 Jun 85)	11
Finnish Editorial Analyzes N. Europe Security Situation (Rafael Paro; Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET, 27 Jun 85)	13
Briefs	
Australia-PRC Talks on Disarmament	15

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

Retired NATO Generals on INF Moratorium, SDI (Elisabeth Pucher, Gerald Mach; Moscow MOSCOW NEWS, 26 May 85)	16
Weekly Moscow Show Focuses on Geneva Talks Issues (Spartak Ivanovich Beglov; Moscow Domestic Service, 30 Jun 85)	18
'Star Wars,' Geneva Talks	18

Soviet, European Reaction	19
SALT II Treaty	21
Medium-Range Missile Reduction	22
TASS Reports Group Meetings 2-10 July	
(Moscow TASS, various dates)	23
Space Arms Group 2 July	23
Strategic Arms Group 3 July	23
INF Group 3 July	23
Space Arms Group 9 July	23
INF Group 9 July	23
Strategic Arms Group 10 July	24
Swedish Peace Institute Releases Study on Disarmament	
(Paris AFP, 17 Jun 85; Hong Kong AFP, 18 Jun 85)	25
Calls Geneva Progress Improbable	25
Notes U.S. Public Opinion	26
Swedish Editorial Views U.S., USSR Stances at Geneva	
(Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER, 31 May 85)	27
PRC Journals Analyze Geneva Talks	
(Beijing BAN YUE TAN, No 1, 10 Jan 85; Beijing LIAOWANG, No 10, 11 Mar 85)	29
Prospects Viewed, by Tang Tianri	29
Issues Assessed, by Tang Xiushan	31

SPACE ARMS

USSR: Reports, Comments on Bush Trip to Europe To Push SDI	
(Various sources, various dates)	34
Clue to Geneva Stance	34
Unseemly 'Aims'	35
Itinerary Noted	36
European 'Suspensions'	36
Enticements, 'Arm-Twisting' Foreseen	37
European Resistance Expected	38
U.S. Claims, Actions Contradictory	39
Talks in Bonn, Rome	41
Bonn Press Conference, by Ye. Bovkun	41
FRG Scientists Study Participation, by Yu. Yakhontov	42
Dutch Concern on SOI, INF	43
Dutch Politician Cited	44
'Working Over' Belgian Government	44
U.S. 'Flexibility' Questioned, by V. Drobkov	45
Talks at NATO Headquarters, by Aleksandr Zholkver	46

Meets USSR Geneva Envoys	46
Visit to France, by Yu. Kovalenko	46
Meet Thatcher in London	47
Meetings Low-Key, Confidential, by Aleksandr Bovin	47
European Fears Justified, by Vitaliy Gan	48
Fails To Change Europe's Stance, by Eduard Mnatsakanov	50
'Alarm, Protests', by Aleksandr Zholkver	51
No Success Seen	52
Boris Ivanov's Commentary	53
 U.S. Gen Abrahamson Seeks SDI Support in UK (Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 3 Jul 85)	 55
 TASS Cites U.S. Gen Abrahamson on SDI Deployment (Moscow TASS, 20 Jun 85)	 56
 TASS Hits U.S. Gen Abrahamson's Calling SDI 'Idealistic' (Moscow TASS, 20 Jun 85)	 57
 Moscow: U.S. Pressuring Turkey To Join SDI (Moscow in Turkish to Turkey, 17 Jun 85)	 59
 USSR: U.S. Preparing 'Fatal Step' by Militarizing Space (Moscow TASS, 8 Jul 85)	 60
 TASS on U.S. Plans To Use Nuclear Explosions to Power Arms (Moscow TASS, 8 Jul 85)	 62
 Gorbachev Replies to Union of Concerned Scientists on Space Arms (Various sources, various dates)	 63
Gorbachev Letter	63
Moscow Radio Commentary	65
Foreign Media Reaction Cited	65
 TASS Reports House Votes on SDI (Moscow TASS, 21 Jun 85; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 28 Jun 85)	 68
House Approves Funding	68
House Bans ASAT Tests	69
 TASS Reports Pugwash Conference on Space Militarization (Moscow TASS, 4, 9 Jul 85)	 70
Conference Opens	70
Conference Closes	70
 TASS Stresses Wide Range of SDI-Related Programs (Moscow TASS, 8, 9 Jul 85)	 71
Gen Abrahamson Cited	71
20 Corporations Involved	72

USSR General on Pentagon's Nuclear War Scenario (A. Fedorov; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 2 Jul 85)	73
Soviet Admiral Attacks SDI, Stresses Deterrence (A. Sorokin; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 28 Jun 85)	76
USSR: Success for French Eureka Project Dubious (Eduard Mnatsakanov; Moscow Television Service, 9 Jul 85)	80
TASS Cites Space Conference Proceedings in Stockholm (Moscow TASS, 5 Jul 85)	82
Soviet Observer Stresses SDI Impact on Geneva Talks (Spartak Beglov; Moscow SEL'SKAYA 'ZHIZN, 6 Jul 85)	83
Moscow Weekly Talk Show Discusses Shuttle Program (Pavel Kasparov; Moscow Domestic Service, 5 Jul 85)	86
TASS Reports Japanese-Australian Talks on SDI Participation (Moscow TASS, 18 Jun 85)	89
PS Views French Role in West Europe Defense (Paris LE MONDE, 4 Jul 85)	90
No Unitary Response From FRG Industry to SDI Cooperation (Duesseldorf WIRTSCHAFTSWOCHE, 31 May 85)	91
Italian Defense Industry Creates SDI Research Group (Rome ANSA, 5 Jul 85)	95
Special Vatican Academy Findings on SDI Leaked (Rome ANSA, 6 Jul 85)	96
Socialist International Condemns Star Wars (Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET, 20 Jun 85)	97
Portugal Interested in SDI, Eureka Participation (Lisbon EXPRESSO, 15 Jun 85)	99
Indian Prime Minister Criticizes 'Star Wars' (Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA, 7 Jun 85)	101
Briefs	
USSR: U.S. Laser Test Planned	103
TASS Reports Radar Contracts	103

SALT/START ISSUES

Moscow: U.S. Renunciation of SALT II Will Mean Arms Escalation (Moscow Domestic Service, 22 Jun 85)	104
--	-----

Moscow: Development of MX, Midgetman Violates SALT II (Moscow in English to North America, 20 Jun 85)	105
FRG Press Views Reagan Decision on SALT II Treaty (Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network, 12 Jun 85; Frankfurt/ Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE, 12 Jun 85)	107
Press Review	107
FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE Editorial	108
FRG Government, SPD on Reagan SALT II Stance (Hamburg DPA, 11, 12 Jun 85)	109
Boenisch 'Extremely Satisfied'	109
Ehmke Welcomes Decision	109
FRG Editorial on Shultz' Role at NATO Meeting (Erich Hauser; Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU, 8 Jun 85)	110
Swedish Paper Views Reagan Decision on SALT II Compliance (Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET, 12 Jun 85)	112
Briefs	
FRG Official on SALT II	113

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Moscow Stresses French Nuclear Forces' Role in NATO (Boris Tumanov; Moscow International Service, 6 Jul 85)	114
FRG Judge: Pershings Violate Constitution (Hamburg DPA, 19 Jun 85)	116
Dutch Defense Minister on Missile Deployment Terms (Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD, 19 Jun 85)	117

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

USSR Notifies CSCE States of 'Caucasus-85' Exercises (Moscow TASS, 26 Jun 85)	118
--	-----

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

TASS: GDR Delegate Criticizes U.S. Stance at U.S.-USSR Talks (Moscow TASS, 25 Jun 85)	119
--	-----

Israelyan Urges Ban on New Mass-Destruction Arms Development (Moscow TASS, 4 Jul 85)	120
Briefs	
Socialist International on Disarmament	121
 MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS	
PRAVDA Cites Bulgarian Delegate on Forces Freeze (Moscow PRAVDA, 29 Jun 85)	122
 CHEMICAL. BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS	
TASS: U.S., UK Hold 'Secret Talks' on Chemical Weapons (Moscow TASS, 3 Jul 85)	123
PRAVDA on European Resistance to U.S. Binary Arms Plans (Nikolay Kurdyumov; Moscow PRAVDA, 27 Jun 85)	124
Moscow TV Sees 'Hypocrisy' in House Chemical Arms Funding Vote (Aleksandr Serikov; Moscow Television Service, 20 Jun 85)	126
FRG's Bahr on Chemical Weapons Accord With SED (Egon Bahr Interview; Mainz ZDF, 19 Jun 85)	127
FRG Envoy Praises SPD-SED Chemical-Free-Zone Accord (Rome ANSA, 21 Jun 85)	130
 NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS	
Moscow: U.S. Deployments in Puerto Rico Violate Tlatelolco (Vyacheslav Lavrentyev; Moscow Domestic Service, 28 Jun 85)	131
PRAVDA Comments on South Pacific NFZ Proposals (Dmitriy Kosyrev; Moscow PRAVDA, 28 Jun 85)	132
TASS Lists Existing, Proposed NFZ's (Moscow TASS, 4 Jul 85)	134
Swedish Riksdag Deputy Visits USSR, Discusses Security Policy (Lars Christiansson; Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET, 28 May 85)	136
Iceland's Althing Backs Nuclear-Free Zone (Olav Trygge Storvik; Oslo AFTENPOSTEN, 10 Jun 85)	139
Briefs	
TASS: Japanese City NFZ	141

GENERAL

SOVIET SPOKESMAN: ARMS MORATORIA COULD HELP EAST-WEST TIES

Briefing at Foreign Ministry

LD031904 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 3 Jul 85

["At the Press Centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 3 TASS -- A briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists on some issues of international relations has been held at the press centre of the USSR Foreign Ministry today.

Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the press department of the USSR Foreign Ministry, answered some questions of journalists in connection with the announced visit of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, member of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to France and the Soviet-American summit meeting scheduled to be held in Geneva.

Answering questions of journalists, the representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry said that Soviet-French relations have recently invigorated. This concerns not only business cooperation, the conclusion of a number of big contracts, but also a broadening of contacts in the political field.

Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to France and his talks with President Francois Mitterrand could contribute not only to a further developing of bilateral relations, but also to improving the international situation, a return to detente, a build-up of confidence and a reduction of the weapons-race, including its prevention in outer space. This visit and talks could also contribute to strengthening security and cooperation in Europe.

Answering the question what concrete steps could be taken by the Soviet Union and the USA to normalise bilateral relations, V. Lomeyko pointed out that both sides could agree, in particular, on a complete and general termination of nuclear tests, on introducing a moratorium on all nuclear blasts, from August 6, 1985, when the whole world will observe the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. The USSR is ready to introduce a moratorium even at an earlier date, upon mutual agreement.

An important step towards limiting and reducing the nuclear weapons, the representative of the Soviet Foreign Ministry pointed out, could be a moratorium on outer space and nuclear weapons, including research work, testing and deployment of strike space weapons.

Moratorium is only the first step towards building up mutual confidence that could contribute to a drastic cut in the nuclear weapons. If the USA agrees to a moratorium it

would be possible to introduce in the course of one-two months constructive proposals on all issues under discussion, including the level to which the strategic offensive weapons could be reduced, certainly, if the strike space weapons are banned.

A number of other measures could contribute to a normalisation of relations, in particular, the adoption by the USA, following the Soviet Union, the commitments not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, not to put anti-satellite weapons into outer space, to stop the deployment of its new nuclear missiles in Europe in answer to the termination of nuclear counter-measures by the Soviet Union.

Interview on CSSR Radio

LD051745 Bratislava Domestic Service in Slovak 1630 GMT 5 Jul 85

[Text] In connection with the announced meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Geneva in November, the head of the press section of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Vladimir Lomeyko, gave an interview to our Moscow correspondent Stefan Babiak:

[Begin recording] [Babiak in Czech] The news of the Geneva Soviet-American summit meeting caused lively interest in the world. Apart from other things the importance of this dialogue from the point of view of improving the international situation is being stressed. Comrade Lomeyko, what does the Soviet Union expect from this meeting?

[Lomeyko in Russian with superimposed Czech translation] First, I would like to say that similar meetings at summit level, particularly between the Soviet Union and the United States, have always attracted attention because they give rise to certain hopes. Previous experience shows that the political will and true determination of both sides to achieve mutually acceptable agreements truly led to success. We believe that both sides base themselves on this prerequisite. The Soviet Union is interested in achieving greater understanding at summit level. We want this meeting to give an impulse not only to the normalization of Soviet-American relations, but also to an improvement of the international situation so that it can help a constructive solution of pressing problems, in particular the reduction of the danger of nuclear conflict, and to be beneficial to an overall weakening of military confrontation and stopping the arms race on the earth, and enable the aversion of the threat of carrying them to space.

It is no secret that Soviet-American relations are in many spheres at their lowest level of the post war period, because of Washington. There are 4 and 1/2 months to the Geneva meeting, which is long enough to be able to undertake concrete steps toward improving relations.

[Babiak] What does the Soviet Union propose in this direction?

[Lomeyko] As far as our country is concerned, during the past few months -- not to mention previous years -- we have put forward to the American side a number of peace proposals. For example, I will mention the moratorium on the deployment of nuclear and space weapons. In order to be able to block the arms race it is necessary first to stop this race and then to reverse the whole process. Apart from this, it is possible to come to an immediate agreement on the banning of test nuclear explosions, to begin talks which would lead to a complete and overall ban of nuclear tests. The Soviet Union is ready for this. Further, we propose a stop to the deployment of new medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. Our country has halted retaliatory measures in this direction until November this year, and if the American side gives a sensible response to this unilateral act of goodwill, it will be possible to extend the moratorium. There are also a number of other concrete proposals for entering into joint agreements.

It is not enough to just have talks about these questions. The decisive thing is the political will to come to an agreement. As far as the prerequisites of success for the Soviet-American summit are concerned, it is necessary for both sides to show restraint and prudence in their reaction to various international events, to prevent a further growth of confrontation which can be seen in many areas of the world, and of course both sides must look for constructive solutions to the existing problems. The Soviet Union is quite unequivocally for this approach. [end recording]

CSO: 5200/1048

GENERAL

JPRS-TAC-83-021
30 July 1983

WEEKLY MOSCOW RADIO TALK SHOW VIEWS ARMS ISSUES

LD071745 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 7 Jul 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with political observer Vitaliy Ivanovich Kobvsh, political observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin and All-Union Radio commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin]

[Excerpt]

[Kobvsh] Now this active cooperation -- economic and political -- between socialist countries takes place not by itself, not in some sort of vacuum, but in the very real world, and it is a factor in the stability of this world. It provides, so to speak, guarantees of a peaceful future for mankind. This is a serious factor of today's reality, just the very existence of this cooperation, and this is now understood by very many people.

[Levin] But, a factor, of course -- this is undoubted -- of prime importance.

Moreover, of course, we are not at all curtailing, but on the contrary we are striving, to intensify also the dialogue, a constructive political dialogue, with capitalist countries. In developing, striving to develop a constructive dialogue with capitalist countries in order to achieve a turning point in the current negative development, generally of international relations, in order to achieve a return to detente, the Soviet Union is undertaking very active efforts.

[Shishlin] We really do live in a harsh, troubled, restless world, and without dialogue, without restoring confidence, without overcoming suspicion and alienation, it is difficult to find solutions to the key international problems. In this sense, of course, there are events which have already taken place -- I am thinking of the talks with the Italian leaders, and the negotiations with Willy Brandt, the leader of the German Social Democrats, and other contacts, in particular those which occurred in Vienna on the occasion of the conclusion of the Austrian State Treaty, and now there are new accords, about which the comrades know: the accord on Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to France, and then the Soviet-American summit meeting. These are of course events of first-ranking significance in international life today, and among the international news this is beyond doubt the most important.

Gorbachev Visit to France

[Kobysh] Yes, all this is being seen everywhere, throughout the world, as a sign of the very great dynamism in our policies, of their peace-loving, constructive nature. We sincerely wish for dialogue. We are trying to overcome existing differences with the United States, NATO, and with other Western countries, and we approach all the talks we hold and will hold in the future with open, well-meaning hearts. Now, without a doubt, nobody doubts that this is done sincerely, that we are truly concerned with the search for paths to peace. In his reply to the appeal by the U.S. Union of Concerned Scientists, about their anxiety lest the arms race be extended into space and generally about the arms race, including the nuclear arms race in progress, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said that this problem really does require a bold approach. Yesterday's yardsticks, narrow notions of unilateral gains and advantages -- which are, moreover, illusory -- can hardly be applied. Now, more than ever before, a farsighted policy is needed, one founded on an understanding of reality and those dangers which we shall inevitably encounter tomorrow. In my view, this is the kind of talk people have been waiting for for a long time. It is an attempt to make sense of all the complications of today's world, and we understand that the forthcoming summit meetings are not all that straightforward and the road to them is not such an easy one. Much remains to be done to make them fruitful, but we are working toward this, and will do all we can to ensure that they are fruitful.

[Shishlin] Although, of course, there is this factor, Vitaliy Ivanovich, in particular in connection with the accord on the visit to France: In many commentaries an idea of this kind is being tossed about -- that the Soviet Union has allegedly decided to play the European card in its policy and use the intensification of dialogue with the Europeans to exert appropriate political pressure on the United States.

In this connection I would like to say that, sometimes when you familiarize yourself with the commentaries of Western journalists and Western political figures about one Soviet action or another, you catch yourself thinking that they really do think in some categories of a unique nature, as though in contemporary international relations, in contemporary mutual links, in the contemporary world, you could cheat, deceive, or swindle anybody...

[Levin] Talleyrand-style diplomacy.

[Shishlin] Yes. That is long past, long past. Strictly speaking, the strength of Soviet policy lies in the fact that it is an open policy. It states it aims openly, and the methods it proposes are those of dialogue on an equal basis, methods which draw attention to the search for those points of contact on the basis of which a reasonable compromise can be sought.

[Kobysh] Generally speaking, if we are talking about playing the card of cooperation and dialogue, God grant -- as they say -- that everybody play that game. Let everybody play such cards.

[Levin] Some commentators in the West are now noting that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to France will be his first foreign tour to a capitalist country since his election to the post of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. I think there may well be a certain element of logic in this, for Soviet-French relations have long held a highly visible place in the world's political life, and we -- and France, it must be said, for its part -- have done a lot in the postwar world to develop dialogue and seek solutions to those problems facing the world. If we now succeed again in moving Soviet-French relations ahead, in the interests of all of Europe and of all international relations, this will certainly correspond again to the interests of the whole world, and, once again, as you say, Vitaliy Ivanovich, God grant that everybody play these games.

U.S.-USSR Summit Meeting

As for the forthcoming Soviet-American summit meeting, of course, here, you know comrades, it will be thoroughly prepared. There is plenty of time to do so, almost 5 months. At the same time, however, the outstanding questions in Soviet-American relations are obvious, above all the question of ending the arms race, above all that of preventing the militarization of space. You mentioned Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's reply to the appeal from the Union of Concerned Scientists. This union brings together several hundred American scientists and members of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences. It is, as it were, the flower of American scientific thought. Incidentally, I have several times seen reports in the press saying that 90 percent of U.S. scientists reject the program for the militarization of space, all those "star wars." This Union of Concerned Scientists appealed to both Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan for an accord between the United States and the Soviet Union on a total ban on the manufacture and testing of space weapons, and in the interim for the antisatellite weapons, and for confirmation of their adherence to the 1972 treaty restricting antimissile defense systems.

I do not know what the President of the United States said in reply to this proposal, but the reply by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee is as clear as can be: We are in favor of preventing the militarization of space; we have already tabled a draft treaty banning the use of force in space, and from space against earth; at the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons, we are sincerely striving to reach agreement barring all the paths to the militarization of space; and as for the moratorium, we have already been adhering to it for 2 years, and we unswervingly stand for the observance of the clauses of the Treaty Limiting Antimissile Defense Systems. That is to say that our answer to the appeal from the U.S. scientists is absolutely clear, specific, and thoroughly positive.

[Shishlin] In connection with achieving accord on the date and venue for the Soviet-American summit meeting, U.S. Secretary of State Shultz issued a special statement. He was being asked by journalists about whether this would be a watershed in the development of international relations.

Shultz showed a measure of caution, and said that he would not use that expression, "a watershed", and here we may no doubt agree with him. He describes the significance of the meeting as follows: I think, Shultz says, that it is essential for us to recognize the fact that this is an ongoing process. The President's meeting with the general secretary will be a very important element in the process, and I am sure that it will be preceded by very energetic preparations. If the meeting is crowned with success, this will make it possible to draft a kind of agenda for the future. Shultz went on to stress the importance of the meeting. It is indisputably of exceptional importance, if one takes account of the parlous state of Soviet-American relations.

In the United States itself, among the U.S. public and various political circles, a mood is growing in favor of leveling out Soviet-American relations. Certain U.S. legislators want to personally foster a warming of Soviet-American relations, and roughly 16 congressional delegations have voiced a wish to visit Moscow in the coming months, so one might as well draw up a special calendar for visits by U.S. congressmen to the Soviet Union.

Nonetheless, we must, of course, recognize very clearly that the problems now in both Moscow's and Washington's field of vision, and the way we regard these problems and the way the U.S. Administration regards them, all this tells us that this meeting will be far from simple. It will be a complex, difficult one, but indisputably absolutely vital, absolutely vital, because the fate of the world today depends of course not only upon the United States and the Soviet Union. It depends on the international community as a

whole, but a great deal in future destinies will of course be determined by the way Soviet-American relations take shape, and whether success is achieved, in the last analysis, in urging the United States to adopt the path of deep arms cuts, the path of preventing the militarization of space, the path of reaffirming peaceful coexistence between countries with different social systems.

[Kobysh] As I was listening to you, Nikolay Vladimirovich, I was reminded of an American play, a show I saw on Broadway, in which the main character says that an awful lot of troubles occur in peoples' lives simply because they do not find the time to sit down and talk to each other. Undoubtedly the dramas of ordinary people, the dramas of everyday life, cannot be extended exactly into the field of politics. However, there is a great deal in politics, too, that takes place simply because there is no dialogue, because the two sides are not very well informed about intentions and objectives. Of course, if the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President simply have a meeting and talk and look each other in the eye, then this is very important in itself, important for relations between our countries, and important, too, for the overall climate on earth. Hence, the high level of interest in this, this heightened interest, although I do agree that it is not all that simple.

Bush West Europe Visit

[Levin] What's more, while congressional delegations are preparing to come to the Soviet Union, Vice President Bush has already visited Western Europe and urged the U.S.'s NATO allies to support its "star wars" plans. This trip has just ended, and one can already add up some of the results.

[Shishlin] Attitudes there are very complex, Viktor Nikolayevich. On the political level, of course, all types of reservations are being expressed on this so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. However, as far as the transnational corporations are concerned, as far as the major European scientific centers are concerned, they are naturally allured by the thousands of millions of American dollars.

Bush, it's interesting that you mentioned his visit; he, as you know, gave a speech at the London Institute of Strategic Studies. It was a fairly interesting speech, which in fact shows the state of U.S. relations with its European partners. I will even quote his words without commenting. In view of the fact, Bush said, that the alliance -- that is to say NATO -- has served us so successfully for more than 30 years, some people on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean have begun to regard it as something that can be taken for granted. There are several signs pointing to this: increasing concern for one's own interests and a tendency to reject responsibilities and obligations that do not enjoy political popularity; continuing flirtation with neutralism, frequently observed when they try to put the United States into the same category as the Soviet Union; and such a strong yearning for peace that some people simply stop seeing what it is that has to be done to preserve peace under conditions of freedom. You can hear the degree of disappointment present in these words about the approach of America's NATO partners to the disciplinary measures, really, to which Washington is resorting in order that everything might run smoothly according to America's dictation.

[Levin] Here, too, one can see the problem of the noticeably more complicated relations between the United States and Western Europe, and primarily -- well, we still refer to the Ten of the Common Market, although they will be the Twelve with the New Year when Spain and Portugal become full-fledged members -- between these two centers. Of course, Japan is another political center, but if we are now concentrating our attention on relations between the United States and Western Europe, then we see that more and more insults and recriminations are being uttered in each direction. They have remembered words in Western Europe that were once spoken during one of the summit conferences by a man who is not now in power but who at one time was U.S. secretary of state and

presidential national security adviser: Henry Kissinger. He described Western Europe in very disparaging terms: an old lady too proud to admit her own ruin; an aristocratic lady who flaunts her ancient coat-of-arms and who still regards herself as the center of the universe. Their attitude to this in Europe was extremely pained. Naturally that is not a fair assessment overall. It is absolutely wrong, although, of course, Western Europe is perhaps losing in the competitive struggle at the moment and falling behind the United States and Japan in technological development. But Western Europe does not want anyone to order it around, and it does not want to let her American ally do so. These attitudes also indicate that the United States does need to introduce certain corrections. Furthermore, since the attitude of Western Europe to the "star wars" problem is of prime importance for us, it's worth mentioning again that there is essentially no active support. In fact, there is a great deal of wariness.

[Kobysh] It's not just that there's wariness; there's an understanding that this is an abyss into which mankind might be pushed if these plans become a reality. You mentioned 90 percent of American scientists understand this and express it. No doubt more than 90 percent of the population understands this in Western Europe and they, too, speak in full voice. Thus, the American Administration is now in a very complicated position as far as this program is concerned: Of course, Nikolay Vladimirovich is correct, a very great deal of money and technological capacities have been made available. These are tempting and alluring but the fear is very great as well. This leads to an extremely complicated tangle of contradictions which they might not be able to sort out. At any rate, I do not see any possibility of its disentanglement.

[Levin] It's the kind of Gordian knot that has to be cut by bold decisions. The path towards the consolidation of peace: that is the main task currently facing mankind. It is a very acute task, and means curbing the arms race on earth and preventing an arms race in space.

[Shishlin] That, moreover, will open up opportunities for peaceful and mutually advantageous cooperation, so that mankind might tackle the many difficult common problems.

[Levin] And not just in bilateral relations between, say, the developed capitalist countries, between the capitalist and the socialist countries, and relations with the developing countries. This, too, is a very acute problem. However, until the problem of halting the arms race and preventing the militarization of space has been solved, which is fraught not just with a new twist in the arms race but with a sharp deterioration in the international situation as a whole, it is simply impossible to envisage anything good.

[Kobysh] Fortunately, the point from which we began today's discussion gives grounds for hoping that mankind does have sufficient stock of both endurance and the desire to survive, and also of wisdom to find a way of living in this complicated new world, a world that is to some extent tragic, and of living in a new way to overcome these dangers and this tragedy, living in such a way that all people on earth feel themselves participants with full rights and of full worth in this great community we call mankind.

[Levin] We draw our discussion to a close with that remark. Thank you for your attention, esteemed comrades. All the very best to you!

CSO: 5200/1047

GENERAL

FRG BUNDESTAG DISCUSSES DETERRENT POLICY, NATO

LD131654 Hamburg DPA in German 1531 GMT 13 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn 13 Jun (DPA) -- In a 3-hour debate on NATO today, the Bundestag noted that there is no alternative at the present time to the strategy of deterrence as a means for preventing war. The SPD called for a vigorous search for alternatives that could diminish the danger of nuclear entanglements and enhance the credibility of the deterrence strategy. The Greens Party was wholly opposed to this view. It put forward a "concept of social defense" under which it prefers the prospect of military occupation to nuclear destruction.

The U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] plans involving the possible abandonment of the deterrence doctrine gave a topical note to the debate, which goes back to a SPD motion in 1983. Defense Minister Manfred Woerner (CDU) said that the current strategy is more effective for European security problems than other strategies. There is no alternative at present. The paramount aim is to stabilize the military balance "with far fewer weapons." That is why the alliance's strategy must be constantly reviewed. He denied that its strategy is primarily geared to nuclear weapons. Its conventional defense capability makes an equal contribution to a credible deterrent, he said. He called for the maintenance of a "limited retaliatory capability" with regard to chemical weapons.

SPD defense expert Hermann Scheer said it is urgent to seek alternatives. He cast doubts upon the credibility of NATO's current strategy, which appeared to be crumbling. The majority of FRG citizens, he said, never approved the triad on deterrence on the conventional, tactical nuclear and strategic nuclear level. He spoke of "mass production of neutron warheads" for deployment in Europe and was opposed to the procedure of fitting conventional or nuclear warheads on nuclear delivery vehicles without making this clear to the Warsaw Pact. It tends to lower the nuclear threshold. In order to move closer to what he called an alternative strategy, he urged the total elimination of all chemical weapons in the Federal Republic, the removal of tactical nuclear weapons from front-line defense, and a clear designation and separation of nuclear delivery systems.

Roland Vogt (Greens Party) called for the complete abandonment of the deterrence strategy, which he compared to "two scorpions imprisoned in a bottle." His party cannot support the SPD motion because it still keeps open the option of a first nuclear strike against an attack that cannot otherwise be warded off. Instead, the Greens Party wants a "concept of social defense." Its basic idea is that it is better to suffer military occupation than complete annihilation. This concept also implies the notion of resistance designed to dissuade the opponent from any occupation because it might consider the risk of biting off more than it can chew to be too great.

Klaus Francke (CDU) said it will be "disastrous to depart from the principle of deterrence." The alliance will have to deal with the relationship between nuclear and conventional weapons in the future and their respective weight in the concept of deterrence. Uwe Ronnesburger (FDP) rejected any alternative models as tending to lessen security. He said that the United States will never use weapons which Europe does not want.

CSO: 5200/2695

GENERAL

SWEDISH DEFENSE MINISTER DISCUSSES HEIGHTENED SOVIET THREAT

PM260921 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 9 Jun 85 p 21

[Interview with Defense Minister Anders Sjaastad by Lars Christiansson: "The Soviet Threat Increases"--date, place not given]

[Text] "The Soviet threat to the Nordic area has increased in the last 20-year period. It is abundantly clear that both the Soviet Union's conventional and nuclear capacity in all branches of the armed forces has improved markedly," Norwegian Defense Minister Anders C. Sjaastad (Conservative Party) said in an interview with SVENSKA DAGBLADET.

Sjaastad, who last Wednesday and Thursday [5, 6 June] visited Swedish Defense Minister Anders Thunborg and studied Swedish defense units in Norrland, referred in his analysis to a recently completed Norwegian study of how the threat from Soviet combat forces has increased since 1965.

The Norwegian defense minister's view of the situation in the Nordic area and the changes in the threat scenario largely corresponds with the analysis which the Swedish Defense Committee recently published in a security policy report. The report stated among other things that the northern European and North Atlantic region's strategic importance has increased and that Sweden's position has become more exposed in the context of crises and conflicts in the rest of the world.

"Today's Soviet Union is in a position to dominate northern Europe in a way that was impossible 20 years ago. At the same time Soviet global political ambitions have grown during the period. This can be seen in particular from the fact that the base on the Kola peninsula and the Soviet northern fleet play a central role both in increasing Soviet power and influence in peacetime and in a possible future war situation," Sjaastad said.

Anders Sjaastad also pointed out that Soviet bombers and escorting attack-pursuit aircraft are continually acquiring greater range and can carry greater loads. The Norwegian defense minister mentioned the hypermodern strategic "backfire" bomber which can operate far into Norwegian territory and out over the Atlantic from bases on the Kola peninsula.

Sjaastad also said that the Soviet Union's capacity to carry out surprise attacks in northern Europe has also increased in the last few years. However, he expects that advance warning will be sufficient for Norway to be able to receive in time the reinforcements which would be needed to meet a possible attack.

In light of the fact that the Russians see the use of armed forces as a means of achieving political goals, Anders Sjaastad thinks that it is difficult to imagine a military conflict arising that does not have its roots in a tangible political disagreement. The Norwegian defense minister does not think that an attack will come out of the blue. The foreign policy situation must be assumed to be such that it could be an advantage for the Soviet Union to use armed force to achieve political goals. This would give political advance warning which would provide the time necessary to give Norway the reinforcements from other NATO nations.

"This does not mean that we ignore what could happen if a situation arises in which the military balance deteriorates from the NATO viewpoint. Then Soviet military power and superiority could be used even in peacetime for blackmail with the aim of achieving political concessions, especially if cohesion in NATO were not functioning well. Our aim is both to prevent peacetime pressures as a result of Soviet military superiority and to deter the Soviet Union from military attacks," Sjaastad explained.

CSO: 5200/2695

GENERAL

FINNISH EDITORIAL ANALYZES N. EUROPE SECURITY SITUATION

PM021436 Helsinki HUFVUDSTADSBLADET in Swedish 27 Jun 85 p 2

[Rafael Paro editorial: "The Stability of the Nordic Area"]

[Text] Practically all analyses of the security policy situation in northern Europe nowadays conclude that a considerable deterioration has taken place. Some say that this development has been taking place slowly for 20 years. Others adopt a shorter perspective.

There has been a tendency among the inhabitants of the Nordic area and not least among us Finns to try to persuade ourselves that the security policy situation in the Nordic area is something fixed once and for all, uninfluenced by all external and internal changes. When new elements have entered the picture -- military, political, or economic, such as Norway's oil -- we have tried to persuade ourselves that the stability in our own immediate area that has lasted for many years still persists.

It is perhaps possible to claim that this stability does still exist, but at the same time it has to be admitted that it has been subjected to new tests. The two surveys by Soviet pseudonym Yuriy Komissarov published in the Finnish press recently (in KESKISUOMALAINEN 17 May and SUOMENMAA 21 June) have given an idea of the changes in the Western bloc's dispositions which Moscow views as aggravating and threatening. The main thing here are all the measures aimed at the rapid transfer of reinforcements of various types to the U.S. Nordic allies. Komissarov's conclusion is that the Danish and Norwegian policy option with regard to foreign troops and nuclear arms has increasingly lost its original significance.

It is striking that in his first article Komissarov pointed out that "health-minded politicians and wide circles of the population in the Nordic area see the preservation of the balance which has arisen in northern Europe as a primary goal. . . ." In the second version he criticizes the doctrine of Nordic balance since it is built on the assumption that Norway's, Denmark's, and Iceland's NATO membership balances Sweden's neutrality "and the policy pursued by Finland in accordance with its treaty-enshrined relationship with the Soviet Union." It is easy to reach the conclusion that such "conceptual constructions" help in objective terms to reinforce the U.S. and NATO presence in northern Europe, Komissarov writes.

In the West, people have viewed the expansion of Soviet naval forces and of the base complex on the Kola Peninsula as a sort of echo of the increased strategic interest in the area. In the Nordic area we have been inclined to see this Soviet expansion exclusively as an element of the so-called central balance between the United States and the Soviet Union. The expansion of the Kola Peninsula has not been a response to some threat the Soviet Union has seen in the Nordic area, but in the United States.

Ever since the beginning of the seventies it has been clear that the United States and NATO have put their efforts into countering the effects of the Kola Peninsula expansion. The aim is to rapidly ensure the Western alliance's dominance over the North Atlantic and the Norwegian Sea and to thereby prevent the Soviet Union from being able to exploit its forces -- the nuclear-armed submarines for example.

This in its turn, can be said to have called for regional defensive measures by the Soviet Union -- despite the fact that the point of departure was exclusively inter-continental warfare.

CSO: 5200/2695

GENERAL

BRIEFS

AUSTRALIA-PRC TALKS ON DISARMAMENT--Australia is to hold bilateral disarmament talks with China in Canberra later this month. The meeting on 25 and 26 July follows an invitation to the Chinese Communist Party general secretary, Mr Hu Yaobang, during his recent visit to Australia. The Chinese delegation will be led by China's vice foreign minister, Mr Qian Qichen. The Australian foreign minister, Mr Hayden, announced that the talks would cover the work of the Conference on Disarmament, nuclear nonproliferation, and the South Pacific nuclear-free zone. Mr Hayden said the talks with the Chinese were part of the government's continuing efforts to engage nations in dialogue on peace and disarmament. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0830 GMT 10 Jul 85]

CSO: 5200/4340

RETIRED NATO GENERALS ON INF MORATORIUM, SDI

PM391511 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English 26 May 85 p 7

[Interview with Generals Meyenfeldt, Pasti, and Bastian by Elisabeth Pucher and Gerald Mach: "Interviews of Three Generals"]

[Text] The lessons of World War II and analysis of today's world situation formed the topics of the second meeting of NATO and Warsaw Treaty generals in Vienna.

Some of the participants were interviewed by our correspondents.

M. H. Von Meyenfeldt, retired Major General [the Netherlands]:

Question: What is your view of the announcement by the Soviet Union of a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles till November 1985?

Answer: In my view this question is not being studied deeply enough in Western Europe. In Holland I never tire of speaking out for considering this Soviet offer on a due level.

Question: What do you think about the U.S. plans to take the arms race into space?

Answer: The so-called "strategic defense initiative" is founded on a desire to turn space into a field of military activity. Which is why, together with many others, I oppose this initiative. Our foremost task is to prevent the militarization of space. Failing this the Soviet Union would be obliged to take some response measures, firstly, in the field of nuclear arms and, second, in the field of developing space weapons systems. This holds out nothing good for mankind. What I regret most of all is that the United States does not wish to seriously discuss these questions.

Nino Pasti, retired general (Italy):

Question: What's your assessment of the USSR's proposal on unilaterally suspending the deployment of Soviet medium-range missiles?

Answer: A unilateral moratorium is a serious measure and it is impossible to argue against it. Every sober-minded person can see that any serious talk on reduction of nuclear arms is only possible when deployment of new weapons is stopped to begin with, and in this sense the Soviet initiative offers great possibilities.

Question: The American "star wars" plans have caused mixed reactions among the U.S. European allies. Why is this?

Answer: As far as I can judge, the difference of approach to Reagan's plans among European governments varies with the influence of the American propaganda. Where its influence is limited, like in Norway, for example, the "star wars" plans are firmly rebuffed. Unfortunately, its influence in most countries of Europe is strong. The governments of these countries, however, resort to manoeuvres to find compromises because ordinary people are clearly against the militarization of space.

The "strategic defensive initiative," in my view, is the final step in preparations for war. And if war breaks out Europe will be left defenceless and will be annihilated.

Gert Bastian, retired general, Green Party MP at the Bundestag (FRG):

Question: Do you see any link between the deployment in Europe of U.S. medium-range missiles and U.S. plans to militarize space?

Answer: I'm convinced that there is a direct link between the creation of an offensive potential in Europe (through deployment of new medium-range missiles) and in the USA (through the deployment of MXs and a vast number of cruises and the equipping of submarines with Tridents), on the one hand, and the desire to hide behind a "space shield" from a possible retaliatory strike from the Soviet Union.

"When both things are happening simultaneously, it gives rise to natural suspicion that Washington is banking on its own offensive capabilities. The strategic situation is becoming increasingly unstable providing no benefit to Europe which is turning into a zone of reduced protection.

Question: How important, do you think, is the new Soviet initiative on a unilateral halt to the deployment of new medium-range weapons in Europe?

Answer: Unfortunately, there is a frequent repetition of the same old story. The proposals made by the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty Organization filled with very sensible contents, are dismissed out of hand in the West as propaganda ploys. This was the case with the USSR proposal on renouncing the first [word indistinct] idea, with the initiative on holding talks about nuclear-free zones in Central Europe, with the proposal on troop reduction. This is also happening today.

In the past, the USSR also made proposals on imposing the moratorium and if the proposals were accepted, we would not be in a situation where the deployment of new weapons in the West entails response measures in the East. Neither side has gained anything from this while the situation has become still more dangerous.

I think that the West should seriously study the latest Soviet proposal and start immediate talks with the Soviet Union, to begin with, on a moratorium for the duration of the Geneva talks. They say, it would take years to discuss such complicated issues in Geneva which is why it is absolutely necessary to agree for the duration of the talks on the reciprocal moratorium on all testing development and deployment of new types of nuclear weapons.

WEEKLY MOSCOW SHOW FOCUSES ON GENEVA TALKS ISSUES

LD301820 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 30 Jun 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program with NOVOSTI political observer Spartak Ivanovich Beglov, publicist Rodamir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, and Central Television and All-Union Radio political observer Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov]

'Star Wars,' Geneva Talks

[Excerpt] [Tsvetov] Good day comrades. Last week Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, speaking in Dnepropetrovsk, stressed the principled position of the Soviet Union to do everything for peace. Since any event can be seen best of all in terms of comparison, I would like to remind listeners of the remarks by U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger. Weinberger called the unprecedented arms race now being implemented in the United States, I quote: The second part of the administration's program for the revival of America. The other half of this program, as known, is the economic measures that have made rich Americans richer and the poor ones poorer. Speaking in Dnepropetrovsk, Comrade Gorbachev characterized the internal and external aspects of our program. He said: We want to go further in the way of improving life and work of the Soviet people. As far as the foreign policy side of the program is concerned, Comrade Gorbachev defined it as follows: to stop the arms race and to start reducing arms stockpiles. Those two foreign policy programs came into collision in Geneva. There, as our listeners know, the Soviet-U.S. talks are taking place. The Soviet Union began these talks with a view to stopping the arms race on earth and to prevent its spread into space. But the United States not only did not put forward serious proposals in Geneva on curtailing the arms race on earth, but is trying to make this impossible. The United States put forward the program of the so-called "star wars."

[Bogdanov] Do you know, Vladimir Yakovlevich, in my opinion you have used a very precise formula to characterize what is happening in the United States now. For the 5th year since Reagan's administration came to power, they have been talking all the time about the so-called revival of America. But first and foremost this revival is connected with the rearmament of America.

From the end of 1980 to date, the arms expenditure of the United States has increased by 40 per cent. More and more new systems of armament are being put into production. This program of "star wars" turned out to be a sort of a culmination of so-called American revival, which in the U.S. President's terminology is called the Strategic Defense Initiative. I must attract your attention to the fact that in the speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in Dnepropetrovsk, which you mentioned, the essence of this U.S. plan is being revealed absolutely precisely and accurately, very briefly, but very fully. Mikhail Sergeyevich said that the program of "star wars," the program of the creation of offensive space weapons, the defensive character, so to speak, of this program which is being talked about in the United States is a fable for naive people. Mikhail Sergeyevich said: The plan is to try to paralyze the strategic weapons of the Soviet Union and to provide themselves with the possibility of inflicting a nuclear blow on our country with impunity.

After saying this, I would like to move on to what is happening in Geneva. Why is there no progress in Geneva? Why did the first round not bring any results and why do we not have any grounds for optimism regarding the second round? I would like to remind you what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said in Dnepropetrovsk in this connection. He revealed the situation very precisely and indicated very precisely the reasons that have so far prevented the achievement of any progress in Geneva. He says: In Geneva, the U.S. side is marking time. It uses the meetings in order to step up its military programs.

Under the cover of the Geneva talks, it is continuing the arms race in space, on earth, on the seas. He says that we just simply cannot allow the talks to be used to divert attention, to conceal the military preparations, the aim of which is to provide the strategic superiority of the United States, the trend toward world domination.

Mikhail Sergeyevich said that if this continues in the same way we shall have to evaluate the whole situation anew.

[Beglov] There is another side of U.S. programming of both nuclear arms race and the creation of the space strike weapons. Essentially, the Americans not only are not dropping plans to build up nuclear arms, which form the main component of the strategic arsenals that you were just now talking about, but the concept of strategic defense itself simply cannot manage without a nuclear component -- this is the ominous circumstances that is becoming increasingly more clear now.

At the U.S. testing area in Los Alamos, the effect from nuclear explosions is already being tested to increase the strength of beam-type or laser weapons. Just now in Western Europe, the father of the U.S. hydrogen bomb, Edward Teller, spoke out at a meeting, where he declared that the already formed stereotype of Strategic Defense Initiative should be revised, that this shield does not exclude the user of nuclear weapons at all, and that people should get away from the existing image that the strategic nuclear initiative excludes nuclear weapons.

He actually makes it clear that the slogan of liberating mankind from nuclear weapons was all a trap with the help of which it is planned on the one hand to involve NATO partners in these affairs and on the other hand to deceive mankind, the international community.

Soviet, European Reaction

[Tsvetov] Judging by the public's reaction, it is not that easy to draw them into the trap. The worldwide antiwar movement is standing in the way of this as well as the common sense of a number of West European politicians, even some from among the U.S. allies.

[Bogdanov] That is quite true, but for all that I would still like to stress the enormous danger of what is being done in the United States. One should not get carried away by the fact that, yes, there is resistance; one should remember something else: that this administration is moving with colossal persistence toward achieving its aim of deploying weapons in space. There is one idea being drummed into the heads of both the allies and the American people themselves -- the American public -- which is that the Soviet Union has for many years now been developing a "star wars" program, and the United States, so they say, has only just started on it. This is founded on a colossal lie, and this lie will continually be revealed because this is in fact one of the chief arguments used to quote, justify, unquote, what the Reagan administration is doing. Here a question arises, one that obviously disturbs our listeners, too. What will happen if after all the U.S. side, after a certain amount of time has passed, does not heed the voice of reason and starts to develop space weapons systems, tests them and lays the foundations for something that will change the whole strategic situation in the world? Here we should probably recall what Mikhail Sergeyevich said in Dnepropetrovsk. He said quite clearly that the Soviet Union will not remain passive, that it will take all the measures necessary, he said very firmly, to eliminate this possible U.S. advantage. We will have no other choice but to take countermeasures to restore the situation.

[Tsvetov] But these, naturally, will be measures we are compelled to take, because measures such as those cannot but lead to a new spiral in the arms race. This is realized not only in the Soviet Union, but throughout the whole world, and this realization is shown, in particular, by a number of West European politicians.

[Beglov] Yes, in that respect this week has in fact been quite a typical one, because a whole number of events have stirred the minds of both the public in Western Europe and politicians at various levels, and they have had to express a clearer attitude to the "star wars" program. One of these circumstances was the visit by U.S. Vice President George Bush, whom Reagan sent specially to Western Europe in order to find out the degree of agreement among the NATO partners. We should also recall that 3 months ago, on 26 March, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger issued a sort of ultimatum when he gave the NATO partners 60 days to give a collective reply to Reagan's invitation for them to take part in his program. That 60-day period has long since expired, and no reply has come. Now George Bush has found the following picture of Western Europe. When George Bush asked Delors, president of the European Commission, straight out whether there was a collective reply, Delors said: "No, unfortunately Mr Vice President, I cannot give you such a reply. I am not empowered to do so. Every country that George Bush visited told him that the leaders of the West European governments now have to maneuver in order to reassure public opinion -- public opinion at all levels, not only the antiwar movement that you spoke of, Vladimir Yakovlevich.

Of course, this does not mean that leaders, such as for instance, FRG Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl, or the British prime minister, have withdrawn their approval. But I would say that in West European politics a realignment of positions is now in progress. That is to say that some West European leaders who earlier hastened to say yes are now letting the Americans understand: Don't ask us for answers on the political level, on the collective level; let's settle the matter quietly, as they say, on the private level.

All in all it must be said that at present the Western Europeans are more interested in finding their own independent line in this matter, and in particular this question was discussed in Milan, where a Common Market session was held at the level of heads of government -- it is a question of drafting their own collective plan for scientific-technical progress. And side by side with this, as we know, there still exists the Eureka project, proposed by France, which also presents a choice other than that which the Americans are attempting to impose.

In other words, in this question the voice of common sense and sober consideration is being clearly expressed, and it will not be quite so easy for the United States to continue twisting the arms of the West Europeans in this question.

But this does not mean that the Americans have no chance left in their plan to involve their partners, as it were.

[Tsvetov] Class affiliations nonetheless are, no doubt, of decisive importance in the matter in hand.

[Beglov] I would describe the state of affairs this way: the West Europeans have shown more or less clearly that they are not prepared to march in formation, so to speak, through the open door, but this does not rule out sneaking in...

[Tsvetov, interrupting] Through the back door.

[Beglov] Through the back door, especially by those enticed by the prospect of participation in new technological developments.

SALT II Treaty

[Tsvetov] If President Reagan's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative is pursuing the aim of ensuring the ability of the United States to deliver a first nuclear strike with impunity, the U.S. Administration's threatening gesture against the treaty limiting strategic arms, better known as SALT II, is aimed at giving that first nuclear strike maximum force. I would remind our listeners that the SALT II treaty was signed in June 1979, but the United States subsequently refused to ratify it. However, the USSR and the United States agreed to adhere to the terms of the treaty. Then U.S. President Carter said: Each of the sides must take account of the fact that there can be no superiority or victory in a nuclear war. It was this recognition of parity which compelled the Americans to sign the SALT II treaty in 1979.

However, when the Reagan administration took office in Washington, the United States suddenly decided that the Soviet Union had supposedly achieved nuclear superiority over the United States. This was stated by the U.S. defense secretary only 2 years after Carter acknowledged the military-strategic parity of the United States and the USSR. I shall not go into citing the numbers of strategic arms of one type or another held by both sides, to demonstrate how mendacious the arguments of the U.S. side are. I shall merely point this out: In 2 years it is simply not possible for one side to get so far ahead of the other in the development and production of strategic nuclear arms that parity be upset. Consequently, the United States needed this lie so as to attempt to achieve a strategic advantage over the Soviet Union under its cover. But the SALT II treaty, to a degree, puts fetters on the U.S. Administration's efforts.

[Bogdanov] Here I would like to ask the following question: Why did the United States nevertheless decide to continue adhering to the basic tenets of SALT II, although, as you recall, while President Reagan was conducting his election campaign in 1980, as in all the years that followed, that treaty was anathematized as something close to a betrayal of U.S. national interests.

The point, of course, is not that there is someone in this administration who wants to adhere to the clauses of the treaty. There are unfortunately no such people in the administration. But there are factors with which the administration is compelled to reckon, above all the mood of U.S. public opinion. If you look at public opinion polls, you will see that the percentage in favor of continuing the process of arms limitation constantly remains quite high and does not fall. Second, you will see the mood of the U.S. West European allies, who take a highly cautious attitude to the fact that the United States might finally wreck this treaty.

In this situation, what has the administration decided? On the one hand the impression is created that it seems to have decided to adhere to the clauses of the treaty. They have devised a very cunning, woolly, and I would say, nebulous formulation.

On the other hand, they have stipulated that in fact it is still in question whether they will observe it or not, because by 15 November the Pentagon must present a report to the President on how to react to so-called Soviet violations of the SALT II treaty. If you add to this the House of Representatives' decision about the Poseidon submarine, which the President must unconditionally destroy, in accordance with the Soviet-U.S. agreement, the House of Representatives has adopted a decision not to destroy the submarine, but to think how to use it as part of the U.S. Navy. You will see that in fact all further implementation of the SALT II treaty has been called very much into question. Over the past 2 or 3 years, especially under this administration, an utterly brazen, slanderous charge has been leveled at the Soviet Union of violating the treaty in the United States. The method is a simple one: accuse the other side of violations, and thereby obtain the right to violate the treaty.

[Beglov] I would put it this way: Were it not for the fierce struggle in Congress over military allocations, in which many congressmen hedged their vote for new billions for new weapons systems with the condition that the President adheres to the terms of the treaty, were it not for the Bonn meeting, at which the West European heads of government said quite clearly that, in the eyes of West Europeans, the SALT II treaty is an important precondition for the success of the new negotiations in Geneva, I do not think President Reagan would hesitate to erase SALT II here and now.

Medium-Range Missile Reduction

[Tsvetov] Our conversation about the positions of the Soviet Union and the United States on the question of nuclear disarmament would be incomplete if we did not touch on the Soviet proposals for reducing medium-range nuclear weapons. Speaking at a dinner in the Kremlin in honor of the party and government delegation from the SRV led by Le Duan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee, Comrade Gorbachev pointed out that the Soviet Union is prepared to reduce the level of confrontation in medium-range nuclear weapons: If the United States and its allies accept appropriate agreements, the USSR will dismantle the number of medium-range missiles in Europe on which accord is achieved.

The Soviet Union is also prepared, and Comrade Gorbachev has spoken of this once again, to freeze the number of missiles in the Asian part of the USSR, on the condition that the United States does not change the strategic situation in the region. The Soviet Union does not refuse to hold negotiations on medium-range missiles with those states of Asia and the Pacific Ocean that have such missiles. The peace policy conducted by the Soviet Union has quite clear directions tested by time and practice. Speaking in Dnepropetrovsk, Comrade Gorbachev again went through these directions.

CSO: 5200/1050

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS REPORTS GROUP MEETINGS 2-10 JULY

Space Arms Group 2 July

LD021418 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 2 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva, 2 Jul (TASS)—A meeting of the group on space arms took place here today within the framework of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms.

Strategic Arms Group 3 July

LD031217 Moscow TASS in English 1216 GMT 3 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva, 3 Jul (TASS)—The group on strategic armaments held a session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

INF Group 3 July

LD031220 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 3 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva, 3 Jul (TASS)—The group on medium-range nuclear armaments held a session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space armaments.

Space Arms Group 9 July

LD091210 Moscow TASS in English 1206 GMT 9 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva, 9 Jul (TASS)—The group on space armaments has held here today a session within the framework of the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments.

INF Group 9 July

LD091212 Moscow TASS in English 1102 GMT 9 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva, 9 Jul (TASS)—The group on nuclear medium-range armaments has held here today a session within the framework of the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments.

Strategic Arms Group 10 July

LD101119 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 10 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva, 10 Jul (TASS)—The group on strategic armaments had a session here today within the framework of the Soviet-American negotiations on nuclear and space armaments.

CSO: 5200/1057

SWEDISH PEACE INSTITUTE RELEASES STUDY ON DISARMAMENT

Calls Geneva Progress Improbable

AU170940 Paris AFP in English 0858 GMT 17 Jun 85

[Text] Stockholm, June 17 (AFP) -- Any improvement in East-West relations depends at present on "improbable" progress in the "difficult" U.S.-Soviet disarmament talks in Geneva, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, or SIPRI, said in its annual report, issued or released on Tuesday.

The SIPRI study said that the two sides were negotiating from "positions which were far apart" on nuclear and space disarmament.

Europeans could apply pressure on the two sides "by supporting a resumption of detente," SIPRI said.

But it also expressed some pessimism, saying that U.S. arms expenditures rose by 8.5 percent, compared to 12 percent in the Soviet Union, and that world expenditures for military research rose by 10 percent -- presaging further increases in actual arms spending in the immediate future. SIPRI noted that the Reagan administration, despite the fact that it has no guarantee of Congress's support, has proposed increasing its military budget by 40 per cent in the period 1985-90.

SIPRI, which is financed by the Swedish parliament, noted five factors which were likely to hinder rapid progress at Geneva, even though demands by both sides for nuclear parity "are more political than military because of the present high level of nuclear arsenals."

-- Talks started at the time that the two superpowers had launched "massive nuclear rearmament programmes," with the United States planning 800 more nuclear warheads and a further 21 MX missiles, and the Soviet Union having the quadrupled expenditure since the seventies. Both sides were deploying naval cruise missiles.

-- Each side had a different approach to strategic, medium-range and space missiles. While the United States considered that a compromise was possible eventually if the issues were taken separately, the Soviet Union insisted on linkage, and believed that a limitation of offensive arms was linked to an agreement on defensive space systems.

-- The problem of a reduction in strategic arms was complicated by the deployment of cruise missiles on warships. The development of new arms made it difficult for both sides to adhere to the SALT II agreement, and the accuracy of long-range missiles created a destabilising effect which was viewed differently by Washington and Moscow.

SIPRI suggested that "only a ban of testing missiles would prevent them being perfected."

— Talks on medium-range missiles had to take into account missiles deployed since the end of 1983, when negotiations were interrupted.

These comprised Soviet SS-20 and SS-25 missiles and Pershing II and cruise missiles deployed by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. There is also the question of British and French nuclear strike weapons. For Britain they include 140 Tornado planes and modernization of the Trident programme, and for France the arsenal of multiple nuclear warheads will increase from 80 in 1984 to about 300 in the nineties.

— The question of arms in space has been complicated by differing East-West viewpoints, with Moscow considering the U.S. missile defense program known as the "Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI)," or "star wars," as "unaccompanied by any sign of less interest in other strategic offensive system." SIPRI noted that this issue had been further complicated by overlapping research on anti-satellite and anti-ballistic weapons. There is also confusion on how to control them.

The SIPRI report also reviews other East-West negotiations in Europe. It said there was "little progress" at the Stockholm conference on disarmament measures in Europe, the Vienna conference on mutual arms reduction, or the Geneva disarmament conference. But SIPRI said there had been "some movement over chemical weapons."

The report noted that Europe could effectively exert pressure on U.S.-Soviet negotiators "in seeking disengagement, looking for ways and means to prevent surprise attacks, modifying the deployment of nuclear arms and atomic doctrines, as well as working towards a resumption of East-West detente."

Notes U.S. Public Opinion

HK180526 Hong Kong AFP in English 0515 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] Stockholm, June 18 (AFP) — The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) said today that the public had a right to be informed about U.S. and Soviet proposals at the Geneva arms talks, in order to be in a position to exert some influence.

SIPRI's annual report said the demand was justified by the evolution of public opinion which today was better informed about nuclear arms and also because an increasing number of people had come to believe that recourse to nuclear weapons was "illegitimate".

The report said that the United States, where in the 1950's a majority of people thought the atomic bomb could be used in case of war, today the majority believed nuclear war would be suicidal. Opinion polls showed that Americans were generally agreed on two points: that the Soviet Union and the United States were vastly over-armed already and that the United States could not win the arms race.

The report said the evolution of public opinion was illustrated by the growing interest in making Scandinavia, the Balkans and the South Pacific nuclear-free zones, New Zealand's banning from its ports of U.S. warships suspected of carrying nuclear arms, widespread hostility in Western Europe to the deployment of U.S. missiles, and protests reported in East Germany and Czechoslovakia against deployment there of Soviet SS-22 missiles.

CSO: 5200/2690

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

SWEDISH EDITORIAL VIEWS U.S., USSR STANCES AT GENEVA

PM061207 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 31 May 85 p 2

[Editorial: "New Moves in Geneva"]

[Text] The present talks in Geneva are fulfilling no real disarmament function. What they demonstrate most is that the superpowers realize the necessity of having contacts with each other. There is of course a great risk that the session that has just begun will be the same as the first. For the Soviet Union, party Leader Mikhail Gorbachev has called the opening session's talks "totally fruitless" because of the U.S. attitude and declared himself "pessimistic." The White House has responded that the talks were not productive because the Soviet Union abandoned positions reached in previous disarmament talks. This sort of grumbling generally forms part of the negotiation game, but it does undoubtedly reflect a major gap between the two sides on the actual issues.

What are most apparent are the differences surrounding Reagan's space defense, SDI. This is the Soviet Union's first line of defense -- in its attempts to find various ways to prevent the Americans from getting under way to any significant extent with what Washington describes as "research" and "nonnegotiable." Presently, Gorbachev is engaged in an intensive diplomatic campaign, in part to heighten European concern over what "star wars" will bring with it -- in the fields of security policy, research, and industrial policy. Most recently, the Soviet leader has met Willy Brandt and Italian socialist leader and government head Craxi. The Soviet Union is perhaps hoping that Mitterrand will throw a wrench into Reagan's works with his "Eureka" project, in which the French are inviting other Europeans to participate. However, the U.S. at least seems to realize that this new French space program is without any real military potential and is not in competition with SDI.

The U.S. military leadership itself seems most inclined to leave fantasy technological solutions to the future and in the meantime to rely on already known technology. The question is to what extent this circumvents the ABM treaty ban on the development and testing of air- and space-based antimissile weapons. Is it really in the U.S. interest to rapidly undermine this treaty? One possibility would be to extend the period of notice of termination from the present 6 months perhaps to 3 years -- something which should interest the Soviet Union without harming the United States and which could create a calmer negotiating climate in Geneva.

Also significant in this context is a decision which Reagan has to make about the size of the U.S. submarine fleet equipped with strategic nuclear arms. If Reagan does not scrap a Polaris submarine when the new Trident submarine Alaska begins trials in September, the U.S. will exceed a "ceiling" in the SALT II agreement which the United States has hitherto observed without ever signing it. After congress forced him to cut the number of new land-based MX missiles to 50 as against the 100 requested, Reagan cannot be in the best mood for compromise. But he ought to be able to afford not to worsen the climate further in Geneva, particularly as long as there is uncertainty about the summit with Gorbachev.

CSO: 5200/2690

PRC JOURNALS ANALYZE GENEVA TALKS

Prospects Viewed

Beijing BAN YUE TAN (SEMIMONTHLY TALKS) in Chinese No 1, 10 Jan 85 p 58

[Article by Tang Tianri [0781 1131 2480]: "A View of U.S.-Soviet Relations from Talks on Disarmament"]

[Text] Recently, the U.S. and the Soviet Union, as a result of several probes and contacts, have agreed to hold new talks on a whole set of questions concerning "possession of nuclear weapons and weapons in outer space." In this connection, U.S. Secretary of State Schultz and Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko met in Geneva from 7 to 8 January and specifically agreed on the objectives, topics for discussion and procedure for the negotiations. This indicates that the long-term stalemate in U.S.-Soviet relations is tending to become more flexible. What are the prospects for U.S.-Soviet relations in the days ahead? We need only analyze a little the variety of factors and obstacles in U.S.-Soviet disarmament negotiations that will be difficult to overcome and then we may come to a probable conclusion.

First, the Soviet Union and the United States share the same bed but have different dreams concerning new negotiations; each has its own calculations and requirements and it would be no easy matter for either to make any concessions. As far as the Soviet side is concerned, the new negotiations on strategic nuclear weapons, medium-range nuclear weapons and weapons in outer space, should stress the crucial significance of possessing weapons in outer space. Under current circumstances, where the military strength of the U.S. and the Soviet Union is more or less balanced, whoever first gains superiority with weapons in outer space will have seized the initiative for wars in the future. Although the Soviet Union set the pace fairly early in developing anti-satellite weapons systems, in recent years the U.S. has resolutely pursued a "star wars" program, successfully tested a space shuttle, an airborne anti-satellite missile and a land-based antiballistic missile with such sudden force and speed as to cause the Soviet Union a great deal of anxiety. The Soviet Union is fearful that should the U.S. gain superiority in the aspect of space weapons, it would have a second strike force to endanger the Soviet Union. Consequently, the Soviet Union has insisted that it is of primary importance that the

U.S. and Soviet Union conclude an agreement that bans the development of weapons in space and seeks to use this as an opportunity to check implementation of the Reagan government's "star wars" program.

From the U.S. perspective, what would be of most interest is the reduction of existing offensive strategic nuclear weapons and medium-range nuclear weapons, thus seeking a way to weaken certain advantages of the other side. Only when a plan is found that can be acceptable to both sides on these aspects will the U.S. agree to discuss the question of weapons in outer space. The U.S. maintains that the Soviet Union holds the advantage with respect to weapons in outer space, that it long ago deployed an ABM system around Moscow, that it also has a certain number of air defense systems that are actually meant to stop U.S. ballistic missiles, while at present the U.S. is still unable to stop entry of ballistic missiles over its own territory. Recently, McFarlane, the U.S. presidential assistant for national security affairs, said that U.S. agreement to resume negotiations by no means signifies that it wishes to make a concession to the Soviet Union, to slow down or to postpone further space tests of antisatellite defense systems.

Second, for a long period of time a gap of mutual distrust has existed between the United States and the Soviet Union and if they cannot find a way to close this gap it will be difficult for the two sides to achieve any results from new negotiations on disarmament. In the most recent time period, talks by leaders in both the U.S. and Soviet Union have repeatedly expressed a willingness to improve relations between the two countries and have explored the question of convening a summit meeting between the two heads of state. At the same time, U.S. and Soviet official diplomatic contacts have gradually increased. After the U.S. and Soviet Union respectively announced, one after the other, that the two countries' foreign ministers will meet in Geneva in 1985 from 28-30 November, representatives of the two countries held their fourth talk on preventing nuclear proliferation in Moscow and decided to meet every six months in the future. Then Soviet Council of Ministers Chairman Tikhonov met in Moscow with Chairman Andreas of the Soviet-American Committee on Economy and Trade from the American side. These meetings, as contrasted with the previous period of cold shoulders and name-calling between the Soviet Union and the U.S., has calmed the atmosphere a little.

However, closing the gap of distrust between the U.S. and Soviet Union is still a long way off. On 25 November, U.S. National Security Affairs Adviser McFarlane stressed that the new negotiations may not make any rapid headway. And in like manner, Soviet leaders point out that the new U.S.-Soviet disarmament negotiations will depend on whether or not Washington displays a sincere and constructive attitude. International observers hold that if the U.S. and Soviet Union want to achieve any positive results from the negotiations, they must establish measures to build up mutual trust, and to resolve this problem will still be a matter of taking a path that is fairly long and slow.

Third, the new disarmament negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union also may be adversely affected and hampered by some "hot spots"

both new and old. At present, such "hot spots" exist in Asia, Africa and Latin America and armed clashes and local wars of varying scale are going on in these areas. For the most part, wars of this kind are directly or indirectly contrived with regard to the needs of the strategic interests of the U.S. and the Soviet Union who are contending there. If, in the course of the new negotiations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, one side intensifies its war of aggression and intervention in a certain regional "hot spot" or creates a new "hot spot" by resorting to armed force in some other regional upheaval, relations between the two countries might deteriorate and unfavorably affect the negotiations. The rivalry between the U.S. and the Soviet Union in Asia, Africa and Latin America may have its ups and downs and the patterns of rivalry may change, but due to the interests of global strategy, their basic positions will not change and consequently it will be no small matter to lower the temperature in the regional "hot spots" either.

Issues Assessed

Beijing LIAOWANG [OUTLOOK] in Chinese No 10, 11 Mar 85 pp 32-33

[Article by Tang Xiushan [0781 4423 1472]: "U.S.-Soviet Arms Talks to Focus on Space Weapons"]

[Text] Space arms, strategic nuclear weapons and medium-range nuclear missiles are expected to be discussed at the upcoming talks in Geneva between the Soviet Union and the United States. But all the signs suggest that space weapons will provoke the fiercest exchanges and hold the key to the success or otherwise of the whole exercise. Although the foreign ministers of both nations reached an agreement on the goals of their talks when they met last January, in reality they each have their own agenda and are taking diametrically opposite positions.

The primary concern of the United States is to reduce the Soviet Union's offensive nuclear weapons, particularly its land-based strategic guided missiles. More specifically, the United States hopes to: 1) reduce Soviet superiority in land-based guided missiles (which account for 70 percent of its entire arsenal of guided missiles) and preserve its own superiority in bomber-launched missiles and cruise missiles; 2) concentrate its financial, material and human resources on the development of a strategic defense weapons system, at a time when both sides are "saturated" with offensive weapons; and 3) prevent the Soviet Union from increasing its stockpile of offensive nuclear weapons and making them more deadly. The United States is worried that more Soviet weapons will mean a heavier "burden" on its future defense system.

At the same time, the United States insists on pressing ahead with research on its space arms program, the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI).

The Soviets' overriding goal, on the other hand, is to scuttle Washington's space weapons plan. It does not object to reaching an agreement on strategic nuclear weapons or medium-range nuclear weapons, but firmly insists that

the "key mission" and "priority" of their talks is to discuss and solve the militarization of outer space. To the Soviets, the "interrelationships" mentioned explicitly in the U.S.-Soviet joint communique issued in Geneva means that the United States must not imagine it can walk away with an arms accord without agreeing to settle the problem of the militarization of outer space. The Soviet Union also emphasizes that if they fail to come to an agreement on space weapons, any other arms agreement would be meaningless. The United States argues that the so-called "interrelationships" refers to the "relationships between different kinds of weapons," and cannot be read as "making success in one area of arms control contingent upon progress in another area." But since Moscow clings to its interpretation so rigidly, despite United States objections, space weapons will certainly take centerstage in Geneva and be the focus of their arguments.

The Soviet Union is "vehemently opposed" to the SDI for the following main reasons:

First, reacting to President Reagan's order to speed up research on the SDI, the Soviet Union has pointed out sharply that it is not "defensive," but "offensive," the purpose of which is the destruction of the Soviet nuclear arsenal and ensuring military superiority for the United States via outer space.

Second, the Soviet Union is aware of the marked progress the United States has made in developing space weapons. If the latter succeeds in being the first to build a space weapons system, the odds of a nuclear war will escalate, presenting Washington a chance to blackmail Moscow with its superiority in space weapons.

Third, although the Soviet Union has acknowledged the United States lead in space weapons technology, it describes it as "temporary" and unreliable." Be that as it may, it will take the Soviet Union a long time to catch up with its rival. Moreover, if the Soviets are to spend as lavishly as the United States on space weapons, it will be a heavy drain on the national economy.

To force the United States to give up the SDI, the Soviet Union has launched a massive propaganda offensive and concocted an interlocking negotiating strategy, linking space armaments with reduction in strategic nuclear weapons and medium-range nuclear weapons. At the same time, it keeps warning the United States that by developing space weapons, "it will be nullifying all past arms agreements" and that if the United States persists with its plan, the Soviet Union "will not sit idly by" but will "have no alternative other than responding accordingly."

Thus far the United States has said that it will press ahead with its SDI research which, it says, is "totally consistent with the antiballistic missile agreement." Reagan told the NEW YORK TIMES recently that "even if the Russians agree to substantial cuts in offensive weapons, the United States will continue its SDI research."

Thus the stage appears set for many a fierce skirmish between the United States and the Soviet Union in Geneva over space weapons. To reach an agreement is extremely difficult. Even while accusing the United States of sounding pessimistic about the prospects of concluding any agreement, the Soviets admitted that there were "numerous problems" and "difficulties" ahead. "We are faced with an arduous dialogue in Geneva" and it "will take a herculean effort and a long time to achieve the goals of our negotiations."

Although the road to arms agreements is full of pitfalls, we still hope that the United States and the Soviet Union will put world peace above all else, realize their responsibility and sincerely do their best to reach an agreement ending the races in nuclear arms and space weapons.

12581

CSO: 5200/4019

USSR: REPORTS, COMMENTS ON BUSH TRIP TO EUROPE TO PUSH SDI

Clue to Geneva Stance

LD272132 Moscow TASS in English 2038 GMT 27 May 85

[Text] Moscow May 27 TASS—TASS news analyst Vasilii Kharkov writes:

The White House concerned over the growth of the opposition to the Washington programme of "star wars" in Western Europe sends U.S. Vice President George Bush to Western Europe as a sort of drum beater for the programme. [sentence as received] It was officially announced that George Bush will go to London and other West European capitals early in June to bring pressure on the United States' allies. The British newspaper "GUARDIAN" writes today that the role of Washington's high placed emissary will be to emphasize the importance of the President's strategic defence initiative to an increasingly sceptical audience and at the same time make the case in the strongest terms for West European participation in the project.

U.S. officials have already travelled in Western Europe far and wide, making efforts to publicise "the President's defence initiative" and trying to involve at any cost the United States' NATO partners in its implementation.

No matter how lavish were the promises made, how insistent the pressure, these "shuttle operations" of representatives of the United States foreign policy and military departments, just as of the "chief administrator of the programme" General Abrahamson, achieved little result.

The matters have not been promoted either by an actual ultimatum which the Pentagon's chief made by setting the deadline of 60 days for the allies' answers. Washington had to lift the deadline since such answers have not come to this day.

And now the White House decided to send the vice president to Western Europe to try to get the consent of the U.S. allies to take part in the programme of "star wars".

Engaging in wishful thinking, the Reagan administration tries to present the matters in such a way as if broad support for plans of the militarisation of space exists in Western Europe. But Washington so far is unable to name a single West European country which has fully agreed to take part in these plans.

The trip of Vice President Bush to Western Europe to bring pressure on the United States' allies again only confirms that Washington is banking on power methods to impose that programme.

It should be noted that Bush's coming visit is timed for the opening of another round of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. If the vice president of the United States goes to Western Europe to push through the programme of the creation of attack space weapons, then can this be assessed in any other way than as Washington's intention not to adhere to the agreement on the subject and objectives of the talks achieved between the USSR and the USA? For the sides determined clearly that the objective of the Geneva talks must be to prevent an arms race in space and to terminate it on earth. Sending Vice President Bush to Western Europe, certain circles in Washington are as if showing that they are not going to revise the United States' stand at the talks in the direction of a constructive and businesslike approach.

Unseemly 'Aims'

LD281551 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0523 GMT 28 May 85

["With Unseemly Aims"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 28 May (TASS)--Military issues observer Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

U.S. Vice President George Bush will visit West European capitals at the beginning of June. As the British newspaper THE GUARDIAN writes, President Ronald Reagan is dispatching him on this trip with the aim of "strengthening" the NATO allies' support for the "star wars" program, and "to demand in serious form" West European participation in the program.

To put it bluntly, the task facing the vice president is complicated and unseemly, and as yet, indeed, there is nothing to "strengthen." The same GUARDIAN notes increasing pessimism among the West Europeans regarding the United States' so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" and growing opposition in the United States itself to the plans for creation of a large-scale antimissile defense with space-based elements. This is perfectly logical. The present U.S. Administration, while covering up with peaceloving phraseology, is moving along the road of disorganizing the process of limitation and reduction of armaments, sabotaging agreements concluded earlier, and unbridling an arms race, primarily nuclear.

The "star wars" program announced by Washington will give the arms race a qualitatively new, even more dangerous dimension, radically undermining the very idea of stability, equality, and equal security and, naturally will destroy all hopes for the possibility of limiting and reducing nuclear armaments.

Only those who wish to be deceived can believe that the "star wars" program is only inoffensive "scientific research." It is just as "defensive"

as the MX first-strike nuclear missile--the "Peace Keeper." This program for building offensive space weapons is part of the United States' overall offensive plan, which is designed to scrap strategic parity, acquire military supremacy, and prepare for making a first nuclear strike reckoning on impunity.

This is why an increasing number of West Europeans have no desire to be deceived and why they recognize that he who undertakes to play up to the United States on this issue also undertakes a heavy responsibility for wrecking the foundation of the process of limiting and reducing arms, the 1972 treaty, for an even greater increase in the threat of an outbreak of nuclear war, and for the senseless expenditure of colossal material and intellectual resources. This is why the visit of Vice President Bush, which is being made to draw Washington's NATO allies into the implementation of the "star wars" program merits an honest definition--"a visit with unseemly aims."

Itinerary Noted

LD120420 Moscow TASS in English 2015 GMT 11 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 11 TASS--The White House announced today that Vice President George Bush will set out late in June on a trip to West European countries which will take him to Italy, FRG, Netherlands, Belgium, Switzerland, France and Great Britain.

The trip being undertaken on President Reagan's directive is another stage of the intensive campaign which has been launched by the U.S. Administration in an effort to achieve unqualified support of allies for its dangerous militaristic programmes, above all the programme of "star wars". The trip of the vice president will be the fourth visit to Western Europe by the administration's key figures within the past two months. West European countries were visited in May-June by President Reagan, Defense Secretary Weinberger and Secretary of State Shultz. According to the newspaper the WASHINGTON POST, the visits that became more frequent are an evidence that there is a growing concern in Washington over the stand assumed by allies with regard to the Pentagon's plans of the militarisation of space. The recent session of the NATO Council in Portugal showed that even the most "loyal" allies have serious doubts about the "Strategic Defence Initiative". They believe that the implementation of that programme will sharply speed up the arms race.

European 'Suspensions'

LD192237 Moscow TASS in English 2214 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 20 TASS--George Bush, U.S. Vice President, has admitted that there is strong opposition in Western Europe to the Reagan administration's plans to militarise outer space. Addressing newsmen, he said, that widespread among Washington's West European allies are "suspensions" as regards the administration's programme to create a large-scale

anti-ballistic missile defence system with space based elements. The vice president said that he would try to "dispel" these suspicions in the course of his upcoming visit to Western Europe.

Indeed, it is feared among the West European allies that the administration's programme aimed at ensuring unilateral military superiority over the USSR may lead to an irreversible arms race in outer space. As American Senator William Proxmire, Democrat, Wisconsin, told Congress, a source of special concern for the allies of the United States is the fact that the programme of "star wars" runs counter to the Treaty of 1972 on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Defence Systems, which is one of the basic elements of the process of limitation of the arms race.

Enticements, 'Arm-Twisting' Foreseen

LD221217 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0500 GMT 22 Jun 85

[Text] Washington, 22 Jun (TASS)--TASS correspondent A. Shalnev reports:

George Bush, Vice President of the United States, sets off on Sunday on a trip to the countries of Western Europe. He will be visiting Italy, France, Holland, Belgium, the FRG, Great Britain, and Switzerland.

Judging from Bush's own utterances, this trip, being undertaken on the personal instructions of President Reagan, is aimed at getting unconditional support from U.S. allies for Washington's dangerous militaristic programs, particularly for programs for militarizing space. With regard to the Pentagon's plans, among West European governments, even those considered the most loyal U.S. partners, very serious doubts and misgivings exist that the development of the "star wars" system will turn into a sharp activization of the arms race.

The fact that the "star wars" program is not getting the reaction in Western Europe that Washington was counting on, was admitted by the vice president himself. In a conversation with journalists on the eve of the trip, he said that "there is apprehension" in the Old World. Having admitted that, however, Bush made it clear that he is ready to set in motion all means to overcome opposition to the plans for a wide-scale antimissile defense system with space-based elements. In particular he hinted that he will be actively enticing West Europeans, experiencing significant economic and financial difficulties at the moment, with the prospect of obtaining advantageous multibillion-dollar contracts for participation in the development of the "strategic defence initiative." As observers note, Washington's traditional propaganda tricks will also be widely used, in particular assertions to the effect that "star wars" is supposedly a step... [TASS ellipsis] toward halting the nuclear arms race.

Regarding the itinerary of George Bush's voyage, Holland, whose government, which must take into account a powerful antinuclear movement in the population and which to this day has not agreed to deploy American nuclear cruise missiles on its territory, has not been included in George Bush's

itinerary by chance. It is pointed out here that in the Hague the Washington emissary will engage in unconcealed "arm twisting" in order to ensure the adoption of the decision needed by the United States.

The trip will also be used to get maximum active adherence by the allies to the campaign unfurled by Washington of "struggle against international terrorism." Bush, who by a recent decision by President Reagan will head an interdepartmental group now being specially set up in the American Administration with the aim of working out further measures in the "struggle," has been charged with inclining the allies to closer cooperation in the plan for preparing and carrying out joint armed ventures against sovereign states and national liberation movements.

As the vice president made clear, he will also be talking with West European leaders about joint economic sanctions against governments that do not suit Washington. As an example Bush said that he will seek a halt to flights by West European airline companies to Greece. At the moment the United States is conducting an unbridled malicious campaign against that country, thereby expressing its displeasure over the Papandreou government's efforts to conduct an independent foreign policy.

European Resistance Expected

LD222153 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT Jun 85

[Text] According to reports from Washington, U.S. Vice President Bush is to visit Western Europe 23 June. He intends to visit Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Switzerland. Here is a latest news commentary. Viktor Levin is at the microphone:

Several days before leaving Washington, Bush said his aim is to listen, to learn, and to consult his allies on a wide range of issues. However, in reality the vice president does not intend to listen to others but to force them to listen to him. And his main aim is to secure, at last, the support of his NATO allies for Reagan's program of creating space strike weapons masked as the Strategic Defense Initiative. These plans cause deep anxiety in Western Europe. There they understand perfectly well, that spreading the arms race into space will undermine, if not torpedo, the hope of curbing the arms race on earth and will increase sharply the threat of war.

This opinion is shared by wide sections of public and it was expressed quite definitely by the Socialist International. Things went so far that at the recent meeting of the NATO foreign ministers, in spite of active efforts, the U.S. side was not able to include in the final communique even the name of Reagan's program. On the other hand, it was pointed out in a number of speeches that implementation of this program will undermine the Geneva talks on which West Europeans, the ministers said, place great hopes. Until now only FRG Chancellor Kohl and British Prime Minister Thatcher advocated support for the U.S. Administration's plans. But Kohl's position

has been sharply criticized in the Federal Republic and Thatcher is reserving her support only to the sphere of research. The reservation is not very serious because it is clear that the research leads directly to the creation of space strike weapons. But all the same, it is a telling one.

Other NATO countries do not, as a rule, conceal their negative attitude toward the "star wars" plan and recently, it seems, their position was influencing the FRG and Britain, too. Thus, in Bonn statements are heard sometimes that the FRG intends to act together with France, but France is against the Reagan program. It is known, for instance, that Minister of External Relations Dumas received--before the NATO foreign ministers' meeting--instructions not to sign the final document if it even mentions Reagan's strategic initiative. And, as I said, there was no such mention in the communique. And British Foreign Secretary Howe stresses that one should not allow actions which can damage the Geneva talks.

However, judging by all appearances, they have not given up hope in Washington that they will be able to twist their allies arms. They over the ocean are used to not treating their partners particularly considerately and they do not allow any objections. That is why Vice President Bush has the task of explaining that if they refuse support for the space weapons plans, they will suffer. But, it seems, in Western Europe they understand that support for these militaristic intentions will lead to a situation which really will be worse.

U.S. Claims, Actions Contradictory

LD231727 Moscow TASS in English 1609 GMT 23 Jun 85

["New Round of Washington's Manipulation of the West Europeans"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 23 TASS--TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

U.S. Vice President George Bush sets out on a "working tour" to Western Europe today. During the tour he will visit a number of countries and will discuss with their leaders matters connected with the USA's and NATO's nuclear strategy, including Ronald Reagan's "star wars" programme. According to a report of the NOUVELLES ATLANTIQUES bulletin which is close to the NATO headquarters, a NATO Council session is to be held in Brussels on June 28 with the participation of George Bush.

Matters pertaining to the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI), as the "star wars" programme is officially named, to the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva and to the deployment of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Western Europe will be considered at the session.

The pivot of the entire tour by George Bush, as is seen from U.S. press reports, is the Reagan administration's intention to make the West European

public believe that the "star wars" programme will ostensibly ensure almost "absolute" deliverance of mankind from the threat of nuclear war. But in actual fact, there is nothing farther from the truth than those demagogic assertions. Public and political figures in Western Europe at various forums and in the press do not conceal misgivings about Washington's designs. As is believed by West European observers, Reagan sends George Bush precisely to make U.S. allies inclined to the "star wars" programme.

However, it is not salvation that the notorious SDI promises mankind. It camouflages U.S. preparation for aggression, an attempt at upsetting the existing balance of forces by militarizing outer space and by creating attack space weapons. That Reagan's SDI programme is developing precisely in that direction is also evidenced by the experiments being conducted in orbit these days under the Pentagon's programme by the crew of the space shuttle Discovery.

While promising in words to render nuclear weapons "obsolete," U.S. leaders in actual fact do not at all intend to abandon the weapons or if only suspend their build-up. On the contrary, the Reagan administration in the first term of its office speeded up all programmes for the creation of new arms.

As far as Western Europe is concerned, George Bush himself told correspondents in Washington last Wednesday that the implementation of the SDI programme does not mean in any way renunciation of its medium-range nuclear forces stationed in Europe.

Thereby he only confirmed that the USA took a course towards creating attack space arms and a so-called large-scale anti-missile defence system with a simultaneous build-up of strategic arms and medium-range missiles in Europe. Albert Volstetter, a U.S. strategist and apologist of Reagan's "star wars" programme, has directly admitted in a statement to THE WALL STREET JOURNAL that within the SDI framework the United States should create offensive arms possessing greater accuracy and selectivity and to implement the President's plans.

While propagandizing the "star wars" programme, Washington is even making an attempt to work out some "rules" for the conduct of nuclear war and for the determination of its scope and boundaries. All this indicates that by including Western Europe in the "star wars" programme the Reagan administration not only continues to adhere to the notorious "limited nuclear wars" doctrine which was worked out first of all for Western Europe, but also seeks to bind the West Europeans still more closely to U.S. nuclear strategy which envisages also the militarization of outer space. And this holds out a promise of new threats to the West Europeans, and to the peoples of all continents as well.

In order to avert the danger of nuclear war, it is essential first of all to rule out militarization of outer space. Then deep cutbacks in both strategic nuclear arms and medium-range nuclear systems in Europe will become possible.

Talks in Bonn, Rome

LD252002 Moscow TASS in English 1857 GMT 25 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn June 25 TASS--U.S. Vice-President George Bush, who is currently touring Western Europe, today held talks with members of the West German Government and representatives of the opposition. These negotiations confirmed that the prime mission of his voyage, undertaken on personal instructions from Ronald Reagan, is to exert pressure on the United States' allies in Western Europe to give unqualified backing to Washington's "star wars" plans and other dangerous militarist programs.

In the face of the serious apprehensions voiced by the West Europeans over the implications of the militarization of outer space leading to another perilous round of the arms race Bush argued both in Rome, whence he arrived in West Germany, and in Bonn that Washington's plans are purely "defensive." But he sidestepped the fact that the new U.S. military space program pursues strikingly manifest aggressive goals. The American emissary camouflaged this militarist nature of Reagan's "initiative" by making statements about the importance of reaching agreement by Soviet-American talks in Geneva. In practice it is obvious that the United States has already broken the agreement on the inter-relationship of the talks on space arms and the talks on strategic arms and medium-range missiles, by separating the talks on space arms into a special category.

Rome June 25 TASS--The first round of Bush's West European tour, his talks in Rome with Italian president Alessandro Pertini, Prime Minister Bettino Craxi and other statesmen, has shown that Washington's envoy has run into serious difficulties in his attempts to secure the West European partners' support for plans of preparing for "star wars."

During the talks the Italian head of government emphasized the importance of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on reducing nuclear and space arms and urged a gradual and balanced lowering of the level of weapons. Touching on his recent visit to the Soviet Union, he said it was "a useful example of extensive and intensive dialogue" aiming to "enhance" international trust which is "an important prerequisite for attaining tangible results at different negotiating tables."

Bonn Press Conference

PM271149 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Jun 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent Ye. Bovkun: "Mission of Coercion"]

[Text] Bonn--George Bush's brief visit to the FRG capital ended with a small press conference during which the U.S. vice-president tried to describe his lightning tour of West Europe in tones as calm as possible. Even when he was answering keen questions he tried to smooth the corners. But he did not succeed in concealing differences on the main issue -- the attitude toward plans to create space weapons.

The newspaper FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE transparently hinted that the majority of West European governments engaged in preparing for the EEC session in Milan treated Bush's mission coolly. In the FRG only the conservative wing of the ruling coalition is displaying the readiness to place its neck unhesitatingly in the yoke of the "star wars" program. A Dregger, leader of the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union [CDU/CSU] faction in the Bundestag, is most zealous in advocating the "expansion of cooperation" in the field of "space research." In an interview with the radio station DEUTSCHLANDFUNK he stated, in a sufficiently sharp tone, that he considers "irrational and stupid" a "European system" of security which would be independent of the U.S. system. The same logic is present in the arguments of several other CDU/CSU politicians.

George Bush said in Bonn that the aim of his trip was once again to "invite" the West Europeans to cooperate in preparing for "star wars" in the interests of "stabilizing peace," but the Bonn stop during his tour attests rather to a new attempt to compel his partners to engage in this cooperation. The U.S. vice-president came to West Europe not to invite them but to prevail upon them.

In Bonn he talked with many politicians of the ruling coalition. Putting right the tactlessness of the White House, who did not wish to meet Social Democratic Party chairman W. Brandt during his visit to the Rhine, Bush exchanged opinions with representatives of the Social Democratic Party. However, at the press conference he preferred not to expand too much on the content of his talks because with rare exceptions he had not succeeded in achieving a complete coincidence of views.

"What are you after: our money, the contribution of our scientists, or our technology?" Bush was asked point-blank by one West German journalist. "Cooperation," Ronald Reagan's envoy replied vaguely. His address to journalists was unusually brief and colorless, unless you count the routine emotional anti-Soviet passages.

There was one thing he managed to express comprehensibly: The United States does not intend to alter its hard line in Geneva and is preparing the West European public in advance for the possibility of a breakdown in the talks on the pretext of the alleged intractability of the USSR, which is opposed to moving the arms race in space.

FRG Scientists Study Participation

PM271328 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Yakhontov dispatch: "Engaging in an Adventure"]

[Text] Bonn, 26 Jun -- U.S. Vice-President G. Bush paid a lightning visit here yesterday. The main item on the agenda of the U.S. emissary's visit is the FRG's participation in the elaboration of the "star wars" program.

It is typical that Bush's first meeting in Bonn was with F.-J. Strauss, prime minister of Bavaria and chairman of the Christian Social Union, who is also chairman of the supervisory council of the "Aerobus" company, which has links with the "Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm" aerospace concern.

It appears from the U.S. vice-president's statements to journalists that so far he has not received the FRG leaders' agreement to their country's participation in this program, although, judging by a statement issued by a West German Defense Ministry spokesman the day before, the issue has in practice been resolved. The local press reports that a delegation of FRG industrialists and scientists will go to the United States in September for the purpose of "studying the possibility" of participating in the American "star wars" program.

Dutch Concern on SOI, INF

LD271949 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 27 Jun 85

[Excerpts] In our commentary Viktor Olin looks at the visit to the Netherlands by U.S. Vice-President George Bush, who is currently touring Western Europe.

The visit to the Netherlands would deserve no special attention if the vice-president has not put aside the main topic of his current tour, so-called international terrorism, and focused on armament [as heard], the reason being that the Netherlands has yet to announce its final decision on the deployment of American cruise missiles with nuclear warheads on its territory. At his meetings with government leaders and members of parliament Mr Bush claimed that the deployment of cruises, the buildup of strategic weapons and the preparations for "star wars" were all necessary if there was to be progress at the Geneva talks with the Soviet Union on nuclear and space weapons. Judging by press reports the vice-president failed to win the support hoped for. Members of parliament from the ruling parties told him they did not share his optimism about quick progress at Geneva, and they said that Washington's military programs, including the preparations to put weapons in space, caused serious concern in Western Europe, as destabilizing factors.

This concern has good grounds. When the Soviet Union and the United States decided to open talks in Geneva, they agreed that the purpose of the talks would be to stop the arms race on earth and prevent a race in space, and it was assumed, naturally, that each side would meet the other half-way.

Unfortunately, this has not happened. The United States has assumed an unconstructive position that does anything but promote the aims of the talks. One indication of this is America's refusal to accept a Soviet proposal that would have created favorable conditions for agreement on the whole range of issues. The proposal was to declare a moratorium for the duration of the talks on space weapons, strategic weapons, and medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. The United States has not only rejected this initiative, it has been pushing the deployment of first-strike nuclear missiles to build up its strategic arsenal, and it's been going ahead in

creating a space shield as a weapon for "star wars." All this, far from promoting the Geneva talks, means the United States has turned its back on the very purpose of the talks. Washington is clearly trying to use the negotiations with the Soviet Union as a screen for stepped-up military programs. The Dutch had good reason to voice concern during the visit of Vice-President George Bush.

Dutch Politician Cited

LD250255 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 24 Jun 85

[Excerpts] Washington continues to push its line on space further. Affirmation of this is the trip by U.S. Vice-President Bush to Western Europe, which began with a visit to Spain.

To judge by statements in the American press, winning over the Netherlands should occupy a special place in Bush's visit. This country has not yet made a final decision with reference to deployment there of 48 American cruise missiles. Will the U.S. Vice-President manage to eliminate the Dutch stumbling block [zagvozdka]? Let us look at a report from The Hague, which talks of the course of discussions in the Netherlands parliament on Washington's space designs. Speaking in the parliament's second chamber, Ter Beek, a representative of the Labor Party, stated that his party categorically rejects the American plans to militarize space and calls on the government to take a negative position in relation to Reagan's so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. The United States, said Ter Beek, intends, essentially, to begin a new vicious circle in the arms race. The debates in the Netherlands parliament have affirmed the extremely reserved attitude toward the American plans to militarize space even on the part of the Christian Democrat Appeal Party, the leading party in Holland's two-party coalition government. De Boer, its representative, stated that it makes no sense for the Western European countries to jump onto the American "star wars" bandwagon either collectively or on one's own. The sentiment expressed is common sense.

'Working Over' Belgian Government

LD271827 Moscow TASS in English 1757 GMT 27 Jun 85

[Text] Brussels June 27 TASS -- U.S. Vice-President George Bush who arrived for a visit here has been intensively working over the Belgian Government to compel it to support the Reagan programme of "star wars". Speaking on the results of the Belgian-U.S. talks Bush admitted that he was pressing on Prime Minister Wilfried Martens to get Belgium's consent to the participation in U.S. plans connected with militarization of space. He exerted pressure at two levels, the government and the private sector. George Bush unambiguously urged the Belgian authorities not to prevent industrialists from participating in the development of space.

As to the Belgian side, Prime Minister Wilfried Martens, judging by his pronouncements, refrained from making official commitments to this effect.

But he did not say "no" to Washington about participation of the Belgian private sector and specialists in the work to implement the "star wars" programme. The prime minister reported that a delegation of Belgian industrialists will shortly visit the United States to study the question.

Bush was praising in every way the decision of the Belgian Government about the deployment of a first consignment of cruise missiles on the Belgian territory, the decision that was made under the United States' pressure despite protests of the progressive public. Just as during his visits to Italy, FRG and the Netherlands, Bush was camouflaging dangerous U.S. projects connected with the deployment of first-strike missiles in Western Europe and preparations for "star wars" by assertions that they will, allegedly, have a favorable effect on the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva.

This showed again the United States' striving to use the talks in Geneva to cover up military preparations whose purposes is to ensure strategic superiority of the United States.

Serious contradictions were revealed during Bush's talks with representatives of the leadership of the Common Market. "Trade war" between the United States and the EEC now comprises more than 30 items. The commission of the European Community threatened the United States with serious counter-measures if Washington persists in the intensification of protectionist and discriminatory measures concerning the United States' import of goods from EEC countries. Representatives of the Common Market rebuffed the pressure of the USA which seeks the change in their practice of trade in farm produce. It was noted during conversations with the Washington emissary that criticism by Washington looks ever more strange in view of the fact that the United States recently signed an agreement with Israel under which serious privileges in the commercial and economic sphere were granted to Israel.

U.S. 'Flexibility' Questioned

PM031723 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 85 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Drobkov dispatch: "'Star Wars' Messenger"]

[Text] Brussels, 28 June -- As commentators here predicted, U.S. Vice President George Bush's visit to the Belgian capital has turned into a series of arm-twisting exercises aimed at forcing the West Europeans to take part in the "star wars" program. During all his meetings in Brussels -- whether with Belgian representatives, EC Commission leaders, or NATO Headquarters staffers -- the U.S. visitor invariably pointed to the need for European participation in the formulation of the plans for the militarization of space.

At the same time, George Bush promised that the United States will show "flexibility" and share with the West Europeans the results of the research in which they are to take part. At a meeting with European Commission Chairman J. Delors, the U.S. vice-president tried to dispel the doubts that

the United States is solely interested in obtaining advanced technology and certain scientific achievements from Europe and is hardly prepared to offer anything substantial in return. As the Brussels newspaper LE SOIR states, however, the West Europeans are progressively less inclined to believe the assurances of U.S. "flexibility."

This morning the vice-president chaired a conference of NATO permanent representatives. As was made plain by the press conference that he gave after the meeting, the Washington envoy tried even here to convince his audience of the need to take part in preparing "or" "star wars" and at the same time to promote the North Atlantic alliance's other militarist programs. He expressed satisfaction at the "harmony" in the NATO members' approach to various international problems. Regarding the "star wars" plans, George Bush pointed to the conviction apparently voiced by all his colleagues that NATO should "continue moving forward" in that sphere.

Talks at NATO Headquarters

LD282127 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 28 Jun 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zhoikver]

[Text] In Brussels today, Bush has held talks at NATO Headquarters this time, not with the EEC. At the focus of attention there were questions on the further buildup of arms, and, above all, West European involvement in American plans to produce space weapons. Admittedly, it should be said that not only the broad public but also government circles of the West European countries realize the danger of such plans. It is noteworthy that in none of the capitals Bush has visited -- neither Rome, nor Brussels, nor Bonn -- has anyone risked openly backing Reagan's notorious strategic initiative.

Meets USSR Geneva Envoys

LD290947 Moscow TASS in English 0939 GMT 29 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 29 Tass -- A meeting between Soviet representatives at the talks with the USA on nuclear and space weapons and U.S. Vice-President George Bush was held on June 29 at the request of the American side.

A brief discussion was held in the course of the meeting of the state of affairs at the Soviet-American talks.

Visit to France

PM031355 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Jul 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent Yu. Kovalenko: "George Bush in Paris"]

[Excerpt] Paris -- During his West European tour U.S. Vice-President George Bush has visited France and had talks with Prime Minister L. Fabius and R. Dumas and C. Hernu, respectively ministers of external relations and defense. He will also be received by President F. Mitterrand.

The overwhelming majority of French newspapers and other mass media are keeping quiet about the U.S. vice-president's visit. It is reported that in France, as in other countries, George Bush is trying to achieve their participation in the U.S. program to militarize space. However, people here have not forgotten the ultimatum which Pentagon chief C. Weinberger issued to France and the other West European countries, demanding a reply within 16 days to the U.S. "proposal" that they join in Washington's so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." President F. Mitterrand has frequently stated that France has no intention of taking part in U.S. "star wars" plans.

Nonetheless Washington has not abandoned its attempts. The U.S. military-industrial complex is continuing to indoctrinate French industrial firms.

Meet Thatcher in London

LD031530 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 3 Jul 85

[Text] London July 3 TASS -- U.S. Vice-President George Bush, who arrived here from Paris, has opened the last leg of his tour of West European countries with talks with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and other officials. The newspaper GUARDIAN evaluates the mission of George Bush as a fresh attempt made by the USA at selling the "star wars" program to its partners and dispelling the fears of the West European partners. The newspaper TIMES stresses in its turn that the main aim of the overseas emissary is to reassure the allies of the United States. In so doing, the USA takes into account the serious opposition on the British Isles as well as in other countries of Western Europe, to these dangerous designs, which are conducive to a new spiral of the arms race and which undermine Soviet-American agreements. While the stand of the British Government on that issue is chiefly of a pro-American character, the Washington project has been repeatedly criticized by the leaders of the opposition parties and representatives of the broadest public circles.

Meetings Low-Key, Confidential

LD302029 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 30 Jun 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Excerpt] The trip around West Europe by U.S. Vice-President George Bush continued all this week. His route is Rome, Bonn, The Hague, Brussels, Geneva, Paris, and London. Bush's trip has occurred in difficult conditions. A rise in anti-U.S. moods is being observed in West Europe. Once Kissinger called Europe, and I quote, an old lady, too proud to admit her state of ruin, a lady aristocrat who struts with her ancient coat of arms and still thinks herself to be the center of the universe. In West Europe they think that the present Washington has not moved very far from such an attitude to its West European allies. This strategic initiative of Reagan's has given rise to great arguments and hesitations in West Europe. There is discontent in Europe with U.S. economic policy, and hence Bush's task is wherever possible to reassure the West European allies.

It must be said that this trip, the style of this trip is a minimum of official public appearances and a maximum of (?confidential) conversation. There will be one big speech, on Wednesday in London at the International Institute of Strategic Studies. Displaying staggering, for Americans, tact and enviable modesty Bush has noted: I will listen, learn, and consult. The matter here is not only of the personal shyness of Bush, the matter is of the distinctive status of the U.S. vice-president, whose job it is not to be at the front of the stage, so to speak, in the blaze of the footlights.

James Reston wrote recently that Bush has learned the lesson of the whale, which consists of the fact that in these waters you will be struck by a harpoon only if you are swimming on the surface. Reston thus concludes that Bush is working in the depths and not striving for laurels of any description. The main theme of Bush's conversations in the Strategic Defense Initiative. It is justly feared in West Europe that the "star wars" program will wreck the talks in Geneva, heighten international tension and accordingly noticeably worsen the strategic situation in West Europe. The Americans, of course, do not like all this because politically they need the support of the allies and then they wish to derive a certain benefit. They are reckoning on deriving this benefit at the expense of the participation by West Europe in the realization of the "star wars" program, and Bush tried to persuade those he talked with of this.

Moreover, he stressed that the United States is not at all insisting on some sort of intergovernmental agreements on the subject, that cooperation and participation on the level of private firms and private concerns is quite sufficient.

Bush even supported the French Eureka project, although in its conception this project has an anti-U.S. tendency. In general, despite all this agitation by Bush, inasmuch as one can judge by the materials that already exists, he was met in a very restrained way. He was unable to remove the fears of West Europeans. The London GUARDIAN has written that Western governments have no desire to see Bush off to Washington with a seal of approval for the "star wars" program.

European Fears Justified

PM 031336 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Jun 85 First Edition p 4

[Vitaliy Gan "International Review"]

[Excerpt] Unseemly Aims

The U.S. magazine NEW REPUBLIC once observed that "George Bush is capable of demagoguery when roused by an enthusiastic crowd." This description dates back to 1979 when the prosperous Texas oilman with a clutch of government posts behind him, including the directorship of the CIA, announced his claim to the White House chair. Having ultimately become "number two,"-- U.S. vice-president -- in the Reagan administration, Bush has demonstrated

in past years that the magazine was clearly underestimating his capabilities. His numerous speeches and trips abroad "at the President's request" have demonstrated that it certainly does not need a "crowd" to "rouse" his demagogic capabilities. The impression is that demagoguery has a permanent place in his baggage, along with everything else. This is evidenced by the fact that the administration chooses Bush when it is a "particularly difficult mission."

They have sent for Bush on several occasions in past years. In particular, on one of his trips he pushed through the deployment of first-strike Pershing II and cruise missiles on the European Continent. Last year in Geneva the vice-president, on instructions from the White House, used pseudoproposals about "banning chemical weapons" in an effort to block the achievement of an agreement and conceal the multibillion-dollar U.S. chemical rearmament program. On each occasion his weapons were demagoguery and brazen anti-Sovietism.

This week he descended on Europe again on Reagan's personal instructions. Judging by administration spokesmen's statements and by the vice-president himself, the trip had two main aims: to secure the partners' support for the adventurist project to militarize space and to try to play down all the growing contradictions between the United States and Western Europe in the trade and economic sphere. On the eve of his trip, Bush was forced to admit that the "star wars" program had not met with the understanding Washington had hoped for and that the allies "have fears."

As the Western press notes, there certainly are fears, and they are widespread and entirely justified. It is not just that in its efforts to involve the partners in the development of space strike weapons the United States is interested in importing "gray matter," that is, scientific and technological ideas and also allied resources and finance. Moreover, no one conceals the fact that the plan is for them to function as Pentagon "subcontractors" who cannot expect a fair share of the technological developments. The main cause of concern on the continent is the dread and unpredictable consequences of the "star wars" program. Many people are becoming increasingly aware that all the talk about the allegedly "defensive" nature of the program is a fairy tale for the gullible and that the plan is to try to acquire military superiority and secure the potential to deliver a nuclear strike against the USSR with impunity. There is no need to say what these plans mean for peace and for the future of the peoples of the world. At the present stage, it is already clear that they are playing the part of a blank wall blocking the path to the achievement of Soviet-U.S. accords in Geneva.

But it was part of Bush's job to demonstrate the opposite to the allies, by turning the obvious upside down and persuading them that, to use Pentagon chief Weinberger's words, "it is not an arms race, it is not an arm at all, and it is not even a weapon." The laser guns and electromagnetic guns and missiles that the United States is creating for deployment in space platforms do not count.

In other words, the vice-president was pursuing a fraudulent goal by fraudulent means. He placed maximum emphasis on the link between Reagan's "initiative" and "success" at the Geneva talks, although, as is known, the United States has already violated the accord on the interconnection between talks on space armaments and talks on strategic armaments and medium-range missiles by placing the former in a special category.

Wherever Bush stopped in Europe he came out with the selfsame "arguments" -- worthless ones. It is hard to say whether his efforts were successful. Probably this is not so important, considering Washington's maniacal striving to militarize space. It is quite likely that it would be happy with the minimum support from its "most obedient pupils in the Atlantic class." Bush himself made a transparent hint at this when he was in Bonn. According to the ZDF television channel, "he made it clear that the United States is by no means insisting on intergovernmental agreements and considers the involvement of private firms and concerns in this work as perfectly possible." So what we are talking about is a U.S. deal behind the governments' and peoples' backs with military industrial concerns in Western Europe, Canada, and Japan.

In any case, regardless of the results of Bush's mission, it is clear that Washington's fantasy about achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union remains a fantasy. Our country will not allow U.S. superiority and will find a way to effectively counter U.S. adventurist intentions. No one, either in Washington or among its allies, should doubt this for a single moment.

As for the vice-president's other aim, reconciliation of trade and economic contradictions, on that "front" no changes should be expected at all. In its efforts to transfer the burden of its own economic mess to its trade partners, the United States is not contemplating any letup. The result is a whole series of "trade wars" between the United States and the Common Market and between the United States and Japan protectionist squabbles showing once again that the interimperialist contradictions are irreconcilable.

Fails to Change Europe's Stance

LD012032 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 1 Jul 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] U.S. Vice-President Bush's trip around a number of West European countries is drawing to a close. His last stop is in London.

Current events, especially the story of the seizure of the American hostage's naturally made certain adjustments to the agenda of the American statesman's talks, but the main aim of his trip remained immutable from start to finish: by every means to impose on the resisting partners those same plans for the militarization of outer space.

It is simply amazing with what truly maniacal persistence and importunity the United States is trying to make its NATO allies at last and completely buckle under and to present the notorious "star wars" program not as the product of the twisted minds in the White House, but as some kind of common cause and even common good of the entire Atlantic alliance.

Back at the beginning of this year, you remember, United States Defense Secretary Weinberger made an ultimatum-like invitation to the European countries in NATO to join the implementation of Reagan's program. They were given 2 months to think it over, Western Europe has known no peace since then. Weinberger appeared on the banks of the Rhine, Seine, and Thames for the second and third and fourth time, but his ultimatum expired and Western Europe, with the rare exception, continues to resist.

In postwar history the relations of the West European countries with their transatlantic superally have known quite a few sharp differences and disputes but perhaps never before have they been so broad and protracted as they are regarding the question of the "star wars" project. Maybe in London, Paris, Brussels, Rome, and Bonn they do not always speak their mind fully -- lest they irritate their patron unnecessarily -- but I am sure the ruling circles of those capitals realize the grave consequences of their participation in Washington's space madness. It is not only and not so much a question of the brain drain and transformation of Western Europe into an American technological backyard. It is the sovereignty, security, and maybe the very existence of the West European countries that would eventually have to be placed on the altar of the Reagan program, and many people in Western Europe are well aware of this.

But what about Bush? Did he achieve success as a fixer for his boss's plans? Hardly at any rate, this time, too, not in a single country did he evidently hear a clear "yes". I say "evidently" because very little information has so far trickled into the Western press. What Bush was out to get from Western Europe is well known. Things stand much worse on the question of what he is going away with, but most likely he is going away empty-handed.

'Alarm, Protests'

LD041923 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 4 Jul 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] The almost 2-week long tour of West Europe by U.S. Vice-President Bush has ended. On the eve of the visit he declared that it would be a working trip, during which he intended to listen and learn. However, all the evidence which has come to light indicates that it was the guest from the United States who preached to all and sundry, forcing them to listen to his arguments, above all on "star wars." So it was during the final stage of Bush's tour, in London, where he met both representatives of the government and of the opposition.

Here too, as the British press notes, discussions were dominated by the U.S. Plans for the production of space weapons. Washington wants to get Great Britain involved in this, too. However, according to an official spokesman for the British Government, the only result of all this was still more uncertainty in our minds.

Indeed, throughout West Europe, Washington's plans for the militarization of space are causing growing alarm and protests. This also manifested itself during Bush's visit to the FRG, although, as we know, the FRG Government was initially more actively inclined to support the U.S. space plans. However, in Bonn too they are now saying that not everything is clear yet there and that the problem requires further study.

As far as West German public opinion is concerned, the results of a recent poll carried out by the Infratest Institute of Munich indicate that at least three-quarters of FRG citizens are against the militarization of space. The executive of the West German trade unions has just published a statement condemning the U.S. plans for the production of space weapons and calling on the FRG Government to abandon participation in them. Incidentally, 350 eminent West German scientists have already declared that they will not take part in the implementation of these dangerous schemes.

No Success Seen

LD041630 Moscow TASS in English 1559 GMT 4 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS -- TASS commentator Leonid Ponomarev writes: U.S. Vice-President George Bush concluded his tour of seven West European countries, which had been undertaken to press the United States' NATO allies to become actively involved in the American "star wars" program. His mission included selling the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), which is Washington's formal name for the "star wars" plans, as the West's "common hope" for the complete removal of the threat of nuclear war. But what is meant is not the attainment of an agreement to limit and eliminate nuclear arms and prevent the militarization of outer space but the creation of an anti-missile "space shield" with the simultaneous buildup of new kinds of weapons, including space attack systems. This is the aim of the deceptive trickery applied by Washington to promote SDI both in the United States itself and in Western Europe. The West Europeans in their majority realize, however, that they will not be given access to devising the main components of the new systems of earth- and space-based weapons. Washington leaders only want to skim the cream of scientific ideas and brains in Western Europe.

Judging by the results of the visit, Bush did not succeed as a seller of "star wars". The London DAILY TELEGRAPH said the American vice-president had not been able to dispel the quite natural scepticism existing in Western Europe towards "star wars." The scepticism is being expressed in different ways. In an open letter to West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl, for example, 350 scientists from the Munich-based Max Planck Institute,

both universities and other scientific institutions in the Bavarian capital voiced strong refusal to cooperate in the "star wars" program, saying it kills all hope for disarmament. The scientists also stressed that even today the development of new nuclear weapons systems has a destabilizing effect and may give the temptation to deal the first nuclear strike.

Well-grounded apprehensions are being voiced that the militarization of outer space will fuel the arms race to such an extent as would worsen the already grave economic and social situations in many West European countries. So isn't it better to direct the funds to combat unemployment, boost social programs and set up business cooperation between East and West?

Finally, sober-minded politicians and scientists realize that the U.S. Administration's bid to gain military superiority over the USSR is utterly senseless and doomed to failure. Quoting the opinion of many American experts, former U.S. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and honorary physics professor Hans Bethe of Cornell University, a Nobel prize winner, said in THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY that despite the fact that all technical initiatives in the nuclear arms race had emanated from the United States, the net result had been the gradual erosion of American security since the Soviet Union had neutralized all U.S. attempts and created a deterrent potential of its own. There was no data to indicate that space weaponry would be an exception, McNamara and Bethe said.

Some people try to ascribe the contradictions arising in the West over the "star wars" program to the policy of the soviet Union which allegedly seeks to "isolate the United States" from its allies. This does not correspond to reality as the Soviet Union does not look at the world through the prism of Soviet-American relations. The contradictions in the NATO bloc are bred not by Moscow but by the selfish policy of the U.S. Administration riding roughshod over the vital interests of the West Europeans.

Boris Ivanov's Commentary

LD071128 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 7 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow July 7 TASS -- "The American vice-president was the fourth high-ranking representative of the U.S. leadership to have travelled to the Old World in the past several weeks," Boris Ivanov writes in IZVESTIYA today, commenting on George Bush's trip to Western Europe. "From the beginning of May, President Reagan, Secretary of State Shultz and Defense Secretary Weinberger visited the region. All of them, one way or another, tried to sell the Western Europeans Washington's notorious idea of militarizing outer space."

"In this sense, Bush's trip was yet another stage in the intensive drive of the Republican administration, aimed at enlisting unconditional allied support for its militarist programmes," the writer points out.

"As is known, neither Reagan with his tough anti-Soviet rhetoric, nor Shultz with his subtle exhortations succeeded in dispelling fears of the

Western European public over the overseas plans to develop space armaments. The public justly regard these plans as, on the one hand, an accelerator of a qualitatively new stage of the arms race and, on the other hand, a brake, blocking progress at the Soviet-American Talks on nuclear and space armaments." "Judging from press reaction, a majority of Western European governments were rather cool to Bush's mission," Ivanov points out. "France resolutely reaffirmed its previous negative attitude to involvement in the 'star wars'. No particular interest was shown in Rome, The Hague, Brussels or London."

"Summing up the results of Bush's tour, Western analysts come to the conclusions that the American vice-president's trip was not particularly successful," the commentary says. "Despite all attractiveness of the 'defensive nuclear umbrella' promised to them, the Western Europeans refused to swallow the White House's 'star wars' bait."

CSO: 5200/1044

SPACE ARMS

JPRS-TAC-85-021
30 July 1985

U.S. GEN ABRAHAMSON SEEKS SDI SUPPORT IN UK

LD032226 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 3 Jul 85

[Text] According to reports from London, 70 prominent British scientists have refused to take part in so-called research into space weapons for the United States. An opinion from Radio Moscow:

The man in charge of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, Lieutenant General Abrahamson, tried during his recent talks in London, to draw the research center at Fort Halstead into the "star wars" program. This was not the first attempt of its kind, and official London and the big corporations see the idea as fine.

One of the chief arguments used to sell the idea to the public is that the Strategic Defense Initiative will advance science and technology. But many scientists and public personalities point out that it will mainly give Washington a chance to use the potential of Western European laboratories and facilities and force the people of Western Europe to pay for weapons that will remain in the hands of the United States and serve none but the United States.

Shortly before visiting London, General Abrahamson said outright that allied nations would have access only to unclassified research and development. Also, British experts would be required to undergo humiliating screening by United States intelligence services. And, in any event, the allies would only develop the components of space weapons, often without knowing where and for what purpose these would be used. Little wonder the British scientific community has turned its back on the dubious promises of the Pentagon that Britain will gain from the "star wars" program. The scientists quite rightly observe that the program will only produce a very dangerous spurt in the arms race.

CSO: 5200/1039

SPACE ARMS

TASS CITES U.S. GEN ABRAHAMSON ON SDI DEPLOYMENT

LD201908 Moscow TASS in English 1844 GMT 20 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS -- TASS commentator Leonid Ponomarev writes: U.S. Vice-President George Bush leaves for Western Europe later this week to make another go at ramming Ronald Reagan's "star wars" program, officially known as "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), down the West Europeans' throat. THE LONDON TIMES said Bush would try to dispel the NATO allies' misgivings over "star wars" and drum up support for the program. In short, another bid will be made to dupe people, who continue doubting the need to extend the arms race to outer space, into seeing SDI as defensive in nature and to try and twist the arms of those who criticize Washington's plans.

Preoccupation with U.S. preparations for space warfare, in the meantime, is being voiced both in Europe and elsewhere in the world as people realize that the United States wants to subordinate all near-earth and remote space to its military purposes and the statements that SDI is limited to "research" alone are a cover-up effort.

These statements do not square with reality as laser weapons testing is proceeding at full tilt even today, in particular, with the help of the space shuttle Discovery now in orbit. James Abrahamson, the general in charge of the "star wars" scheme, bluntly admitted the special significance of the Discovery crew's experiments. What is under way thus are trials of weapons intended for deployment both on earth and in space. THE NEW YORK TIMES said all indications were that Ronald Reagan was reluctant to forgo the "star wars" concept. And this judgement is borne out by facts. The Pentagon does not make a secret out of the fact that its scientists are looking into ways of making gas laser and beam weapons, rail guns and the like. The deployment of such weapons is merely a matter of time, depending on the state of their readiness.

According to an admission by selfsame Abrahamson, it will take not more than two or three years to deploy the SDI system in full. The admission is important since it reveals as hypocrites the Washington spokesmen claiming that SDI is confined to "research". As the proverb goes, the proof of the pudding is in the eating. The same principle applies to space weapons as well: To be able to deploy them in space in such a short time, one should have them ready. This is why the Washington spokesmens' contentions about "pure research" sound false and unconvincing. Moreover, they are disproved by official announcements of the Pentagon itself such as its report that it has already tested laser and neutron irradiation systems which can be used in Western Europe as part of the "star wars" project.

U.S. Undersecretary of Defense Fred Ikle told a recent congressional hearing that the "star wars" program was the cornerstone of U.S. military policy. And Washington is pulling all the stops out to make the West European accept SDI not at all of course for the sake of the latter's security but for the sake of committing them to its practical preparations for war, including a war in space.

TASS HITS U.S. GEN ABRAHAMSON'S CALLING SDI 'IDEALISTIC'

LD201923 Moscow TASS in English 1854 GMT 20 Jun 85

["Intended for Credulous People"--TASS Headline]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS--TASS news analyst Valeriy Vavilov writes:

The purpose of the "star wars" programme is to try to find a way to prevent nuclear war and war in general. This is how, paradoxically as it may seem, Reagan's programme is defined by Lieutenant General James Abrahamson, director of the U.S. organization for the implementation of the programme. He maintains that with this end in view the USA would like to strengthen its defence potential and that that will ensure a more stable situation at critical moments.

His "idealistic", as he puts it, idea of preventing a war by transferring the arms race to outer space is not new. President Reagan, too, when publicising his programme, assured that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) would render nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

It is quite obvious that such tales are aimed at lulling the public opinion and at concealing Washington's true intentions: through the militarisation of outer space to achieve military superiority, having upset in its favour the military-strategic parity between the USA and the Soviet Union [sentence as received] The "star wars" plans in actual fact serve the aim of creating a possibility for the United States to neutralise Soviet forces for the containment of a potential aggressor and to get freedom of action for delivering a nuclear strike under the cover of the shield of an anti-missile defence system against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The British FINANCIAL TIMES, pointing out that it becomes increasingly difficult to Washington to conceal its true intentions, wrote in this connection that if a great power creates an anti-missile defence system, it will believe in its ability to deliver a nuclear strike without the danger of a retaliatory one.

No, a "peaceful," "defensive" large-scale anti-missile defence system with space-based elements which is being propagandised by Washington cannot have a "stabilising effect", as the Pentagon strategists assert, on the situation in the world. Acie Byrd, member of the Executive Committee of the American National Nuclear Weapon Freeze Campaign, cautions that to militarise outer space is the last line beyond which there will be full annihilation of terrestrial civilisation.

An immediate moratorium on nuclear and space arms, as the Soviet Union has suggested, would be an effective means to get rid of nuclear blackmail and to prevent an outbreak of a nuclear war. That would stop the arms race on earth and would prevent it from spreading over to outer space. A freeze on nuclear arms quantitatively and qualitatively, and not a space militarisation system being created by Washington, is one of effective measures to avert the threat of nuclear war.

CSO: 5200/1041

SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW: U.S. PRESSURING TURKEY TO JOIN SDI

LD181524 Moscow in Turkish to Turkey 1730 GMT 17 Jun 85

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpt] The United States, intimidating Turkey with fabrications about a Soviet war threat and promising large amounts of loans, insists on the participation of Ankara in star wars plans without any hesitation. Weinberger and Straus-Huoe, U.S. ambassador in Ankara, are especially uncompromising in this respect.

As some Turkish newspapers stress, unfortunately there are circles in Turkey who go along with American strategists. TURCUMAN, published in Istanbul, mentions the following statement of Turkish Defense Minister Yavuzturk. The minister, stressing the possibility of participation of Turkey in one of the projects, pointed out that in Turkey, there are organizations within the armed forces and research centers at civilian institutes and universities. The Turkish Government, as if fulfilling this intention, set up a board for determining the extent of participation of Turkey in the U.S. star wars program. The board, consisting of representatives from the Turkish Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the Office of Chief of Staff, will establish at which stage Turkey will be able to participate in the project. There is no need to prove how dangerous this is for Turkey, which is being dragged into U.S. adventures. Should imperialism bring about a nuclear war, then Turkey will, against its desire and will, be dragged into this war and [word indistinct] be exposed to a destructive retaliatory strike. Social circles in Turkey understand this. According to MILLIYET, Turkish social circles do not share the attitude of those who wish to (?expand) the arms race to [word indistinct]. Many Turkish press organs condemn the U.S. star wars plans and want these plans to be given up. It is not possible to disagree. All people, including Turkish people, are not for preparations for a nuclear holocaust which will end civilization [words indistinct]. They want to live in peace.

CSO: 5200/1041

USSR: U.S. PREPARING 'FATAL STEP' BY MILITARIZING SPACE

LD082249 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1555 GMT 8 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow, 8 Jul (TASS) -- TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Over the past 2 years, the present U.S. Administration has been trying with a persistence worthy of better application to convince world public opinion that supposedly the only effective way of eliminating the threat of nuclear war on earth lies in intensive deployment of U.S. weapons systems in space.

FRG Defense Minister Manfred Woerner, a convinced Atlanticist and zealous apologist for any of Washington's military adventures, in a moment of frankness revealed the true essence of Washington's aims on "arms control" problems. In an interview with the West German magazine DEUTSCHLAND MAGAZIN, he admitted that the deployment of large-scale U.S. antimissile defense in space is far from proposing any kind of reduction in U.S. offensive weapons. Woerner even admitted that the United States' old strategy of building up nuclear weapons is just as "morally justified" as the creation of a large-scale antimissile defense system by the United States.

Continually confirming its determination to deploy strike weapons systems in space, and having begun practical implementation of plans in preparation for "star wars," the Washington administration is demonstrating to the whole world its irresponsible disdain for the catastrophic consequences with which the militarization of near-earth space is fraught.

Obviously, current military-political ideas and the desire to achieve illusory military advantages by moving the arms race into space are winning in Washington. Despite protests from world public opinion, the United States is preparing to take a fatal step with irreversible consequences which will inevitably increase the threat of nuclear war and wreck the entire process of arms limitation and reduction.

There are now real preconditions in the world for effectively averting the militarization of space. The Soviet Union has solemnly announced that it will not be the first to step into space with weapons.

At the Soviet-American talks in Geneva, the USSR is making tireless efforts to come to agreement on the full banning of the building, testing, and deployment of strike space systems. Two years ago, the Soviet side announced the introduction of a moratorium on the introduction of an antisatellite weapon into space. The USSR came out with the initiative in order that both sides completely cease work on the creation of new anti-satellite systems and that these weapons already possessed by the USSR and the United States, including those on which testing had not been completed, be destroyed.

Strategic stability and trust would undoubtedly be strengthened were the United States to agree with the USSR in a binding form to adhere to the terms of the open-ended treaty on limitation of antimissile defense systems. The Soviet Union is strictly fulfilling its obligations according to this treaty and is not building strike space weapons or a large-scale antimissile defense.

It is possible to resolve the tasks of not permitting an arms race in space and to stop it on earth given political will on the part of sides and a sincere desire to attain this historical aim. The Soviet Union has this desire and this will.

CSO: 5200/1039

SPACE ARMS

JPRS-TAC-85-021
30 July 1985

TASS ON U.S. PLANS TO USE NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS TO POWER ARMS

LD081427 Moscow TASS in English 1358 GMT 8 Jul 85

[Text] Washington July 8 TASS -- The newspaper BALTIMORE SUN has learned that late in May the U.S. President signed a secret directive of the National Security Council which provided for the research into various methods of obtaining energy from nuclear weapons. The document said, among other things, that the U.S. would study the concepts of the utilization of nuclear energy in the devices intended for the destruction of ballistic missiles at a long distance. According to the newspaper, the creation of a powerful laser installation which would obtain energy from an explosion of a hydrogen bomb in outer space is being examined today.

Last February Defense Secretary Weinberger and Secretary of Energy Herrington signed a joint document under which their two departments would actively work for the creation of new types of nuclear weapons with the aim to use them within the framework of the notorious "Strategic Defence Initiative". In fiscal 1986 already the Department of Energy is planning to spend on it 282 million dollars. In his turn, the Assistant Defense Secretary for Atomic Energy Wagner who spoke recently at hearings in the House of Representatives of the Congress, pointed out in his speech that the plans of the utilization of nuclear weapons in a large-scale anti-ballistic missile system with space-based elements was in the centre of attention of the military department today. According to BALTIMORE SUN, the senior officials of the administration expected a further increase of allocations for this purpose. It is planned to hold underground tests of the improved nuclear warheads for their subsequent utilization in space weapon systems.

CSO: 5200/1039

SPACE ARMS

GORBACHEV REPLIES TO UNION OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS ON SPACE ARMS

Gorbachev Letter

LD050914 Moscow TASS in English 0914 GMT 5 Jul 85

["Outer Space Should Serve Peace"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, July 5 TASS -- Follows full text of Mikhail Gorbachev's reply to the message from the "Union of Concerned Scientists":

"Dear Mr. Kendall,

"I have received the message sent the message sent by you on behalf of the 'Union of Concerned Scientists' with a call for a ban on space weapons. I want to say that I deeply respect the opinion of prominent scientists who better than many others are aware of what dangerous consequences to mankind the spreading of the arms race to outer space and the conversion of space into an arena of military rivalry would lead to.

"The Union of Concerned Scientists' well-groundedly demands that a clear and irrevocable political solution be made, the solution which would prevent militarisation of outer space and would leave it free for peaceful cooperation. Really, this problem requires a bold approach."

"Hardly applicable in this question are the standards of yesterday, narrow notions of one-sided benefits and advantages, and illusory ones, too. What is essential now as never before is a far-sighted policy based on the understanding of realities and of the dangers which we shall inevitably encounter tomorrow, if today those who can and must make the only right decision evade the responsibility which rests with them.

"On behalf of the Soviet leadership I want to state in all definiteness that the Soviet Union will not be the first to make a step into outer space with weapons. We shall make every effort to convince other countries, and above all the United States of America, not to make such a fatal step which would inevitably increase the threat of nuclear war and would give an impetus to the uncontrolled arms race in all directions".

"Proceeding from this goal, the Soviet Union, as you evidently know, has made a radical proposal in the United Nations organization, tabling a draft treaty on the prohibition of the use of force in space and from space against earth. If the United States joined the vast majority of states that have supported this initiatives, the issue of space weapons could be closed once and for all.

"At the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva we are seeking to come to terms on a full ban on the development, testing and deployment of space attack systems. Such a ban would make it possible not only to preserve outer space for peaceful development, research and scientific discoveries but also to launch the process of sharply reducing the eliminating nuclear weapons.

"We have also repeatedly taken unilateral steps which have been called upon to set a good example to the United States. It is for two years now that the Soviet Union has maintained its moratorium on the placement of anti-satellite weapons in outer space, and it will continue abiding by it for as long as the other states will be acting in the same way. Lying on the table in Washington is our proposal for both sides to put a total end to efforts to develop new anti-satellite systems and for such systems already possessed by the USSR and the United States, including those whose testing has not yet been completed, to be scrapped. The actions of the Americans side will show already in the near future which decision the U.S. Administration will prefer.

"Strategic stability and trust would, no doubt, be strengthened if the United States agreed together with the USSR in a binding form to reaffirm commitment to the regime of the Treaty on the Limitation of Antiballistic Missile Systems, a treaty of unlimited duration.

"The Soviet Union is not developing attack space weapons or a large-scale ABM system, just as it is not laying the foundation for such a defense, it strictly adheres to its obligations under the treaty as a whole and in its particular aspects, unswervingly observes the spirit and the letter of that document of paramount importance. We invite the American leadership to join us in that undertaking, renounce the plans of space militarization that are now in the making, plans which would invariably lead to the breakup of that document -- the key link of the entire process of nuclear arms limitations.

"The USSR proceeds from the premise that the practical fulfillment of the task of preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth is possible given the political will and sincere desire of both sides to work toward attaining that historic goal. The Soviet Union has such a desire and such a will.

"I wish the 'Union of Concerned Scientists' and all of its members successes in the noble work for the good of peace and progress.

Respectfully,

Mikhail Gorbachev"

The well-known American public organization "The Union of Concerned Scientists" affiliating several hundred prominent scientists, members of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA, recently addressed the general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, M.S. Gorbachev, and the U.S. President, R.W. Reagan, with the call for the USSR and the U.S. to agree on the complete prohibition of the development and testing of space arms and, in the meantime, to introduce a mutual moratorium on the further testing of anti-satellite weapons and reaffirm their allegiance to the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-ballistic Missile Systems.

Moscow Radio Commentary

LD082137 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 Jul 85

[Text] The world press and prominent state and public figures of many countries continue to comment on Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's reply to the appeal by the American Union of Concerned Scientists. Here is Aleksandr Zholkver, our political observer.

American scientists, in their appeal to the leaders of the USSR and the USA, have again raised a question that is of concern to the widest circles of world public. It is about the prevention of the spread of the arms race to outer space, which would have the most dangerous consequences for the whole of mankind. This is understood by scientists more clearly than by anyone else, and by no means only by American scientists. Just in the last few days 350 leading scientists of the FRG in particular came out against Washington's Strategic Defense Initiative in space. But is it even still possible to prevent the arms race in outer space? The USSR believes that a practical solution to this problem is possible, given political will and a sincere desire to try and achieve this aim. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's reply to the American scientists clearly confirms that the Soviet Union has such a desire and will. On behalf of the Soviet leadership it is quite definitely stated that the USSR will not take the first step in carrying arms into outer space. I would remind you that our country 2 years ago introduced a moratorium on sending antisatellite weapons into outer space. Now it has again been emphasized that this moratorium will be valid as long as other states behave in the same manner. On the table in Washington lies our proposal that both sides should stop work on the creation of new antisatellite devices, and that the devices of this type which the USSR and the United States already have, including those whose tests have not been completed, should be destroyed. Moreover, our country has made a radical proposal to the UN -- a projected treaty on the banning of the use of force in outer space, and of force from outer space towards earth. This initiative was supported by the overwhelming majority of states. If the American delegation had not voted against it, the question of space weapons could have been closed once and for all. The question of banning the creation, testing and deployment of strike space systems is presently being discussed at the Soviet-American negotiations at Geneva. We are sincerely striving to achieve an accord on such a total ban, and we invite the American leadership to drop the plans being hatched for the militarization of outer space. The American side's actions in the near future will show which decision the U.S. Administration prefers.

Foreign Media Reaction Cited

PM081446 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Jul 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS roundup dated 6 July: "Pursuing a Consistent Course"]

[Text] The statement made on the Soviet leadership's behalf that the USSR will not be first to put weapons in space and that the Soviet Union's consistent efforts are aimed at averting the threat of nuclear war has been greeted with fervent approval by the world public.

This is demonstrated by the foreign press response to Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's reply to the appeal by the well-known U.S. public organization the "Union of Concerned Scientists" and the conversation between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and P.E. Trudeau, prominent politician and former Canadian prime minister. The mass media's commentaries note the USSR's political will and sincere desire to achieve the historic goal of preventing an arms race in space and halting it on earth.

"The Soviet leader proposed," THE NEW YORK TIMES stresses, "that the United States enter into a binding agreement with the Soviet Union to confirm their commitment to the terms of the open-ended Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems. In his reply to the Union of Concerned Scientists' appeal that the USSR and the United States agree to a complete ban on the creation and testing of space arms and at the same time impose a mutual moratorium on further antisatellite weapon tests and confirm their commitment to the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems, M.S. Gorbachev shared the concern for the fate of peace expressed by the scientists. Since Moscow views this treaty as a key element in the entire process of nuclear arms limitation, the general secretary made it clear that Washington's 'star wars' plans aimed at creating a space-based ABM system will inevitably break that treaty." The newspaper is forced to acknowledge that the Reagan administration's actions in implementing its notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" are actually aimed at undermining the ABM Treaty, which is a major obstacle in the way of militarizing space and implementing the "star wars" program. THE NEW YORK TIMES recalls in particular the "U.S. Defense Department's broad interpretation of the ABM Treaty and its 15 planned large-scale experiments which clear the way for the active testing of space armaments."

The Canadian press stresses that during the conversation in Moscow between M.S. Gorbachev and P.E. Trudeau it was noted that curtailing the arms race would meet the fundamental interests of all the peoples.

As the French newspaper LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS writes, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee "confirmed during the conversation with his Canadian guest Moscow's commitment to the idea of general disarmament and pointed out that the Soviet Union's consistent efforts are aimed at averting the threat of nuclear war, preventing an arms race in space, halting it on earth, and ensuring a move toward eliminating all nuclear weapons everywhere."

"On behalf of the Soviet leadership, M.S. Gorbachev stated with the utmost clarity that the USSR will not be first to put weapons in space," Britain's DAILY TELEGRAPH states. The British Communist newspaper MORNING STAR points out that "the USSR has repeatedly made unilateral moves aimed at setting a good example to the United States. In particular, 2 years ago Moscow imposed a moratorium on the launching of antisatellite weapons into space which remains in force as long as other states follow suit. There is another Soviet proposal on the table in Washington to the effect that both sides completely halt their work on creating new antisatellite facilities and that the facilities already possessed by the USSR and the United States, including those which have not been fully tested, be destroyed."

"The USSR consistently opposes the arms race in space" is how the INDIAN EXPRESS sums up the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's reply. Moscow will continue to make every effort to persuade other countries, primarily the United States, not to take that fatal step which would inevitably increase the threat of nuclear war and give impetus to an uncontrolled arms race in all areas.

The Soviet Union, which strictly observes the 1972 treaty, again urged the United States to show goodwill and put a stop to the question of transferring the arms race to space, a Cyprus television commentator has stated. Now more than ever before we need a far-sighted policy based on an understanding of the realities and all the dangers which mankind will inevitably face in the future if those who can and must take the only correct decision now shirk their responsibility.

Moscow is pursuing just such a far-sighted policy, as is demonstrated by the Soviet leader's reply to the U.S. public organization's appeal and by the results of his conversation with the prominent Canadian politician.

"Space Must Serve Peace"; "Moscow Opposes Arms Race in Space"; "Firm Will for Peace" are the kind of headlines used by Hungary's newspapers for their reports from Moscow. "There is profound satisfaction throughout the world at the Soviet leader's statement that the USSR will not be first to put weapons in space," NEPSZABADSAG points out.

Guided by the interests of all mankind, Bulgaria's RABOTNICHESKO DELO notes, the Soviet Union has submitted a radical proposal to the United Nations: a draft treaty banning the use of force in space and from space against the earth. If the United States joined the overwhelming majority of states in supporting that initiative, the space weapons question could be ended once and for all.

As Poland's TRYBUNA LUDU points out, the USSR proceeds from the premise that the task of preventing the arms race in space and ending it on earth can only be solved in practice if both side have the political will and a sincere desire to achieve that historic goal. The Soviet Union has just such a desire and will.

CSO: 5200/1039

TASS REPORTS HOUSE VOTES ON SDI

House Approves Funding

LD210851 Moscow TASS in English 0811 GMT 21 Jun 85

[Text] Washington June 21 TASS -- The House of Representatives bowed to the Reagan administration's pressure to vote for 2.5 billion dollars in funding for the "star wars" program in the next fiscal year. The sum is nearly twice as big as appropriations set aside for the purpose this year.

During the keen debates on the spending, which lasted for nearly seven hours, the plans to militarize outer space came under justified criticisms from a number of congressmen. Democrat Ronald Dellums from California argued, for instance, that the "star wars" system was intended not for defense, as claimed by the White House and the Pentagon, but for offense. Along with the MX, Trident, Pershing-2 and cruise missiles, the array of space arms would give grounds for assuming that the United States was moving to acquire first-strike capability, he said.

But those who, like Dellums, voiced serious worries about the "star wars" program found themselves in the minority. It is said here that the prospect of the military-industrial complex, whose interests are upheld by the Reagan administration especially vigorously, winning lucrative Pentagon orders to develop space weapons systems weighed heavily in the White House. According to some estimates, a matter of 50 to 100 billion dollars will be spent on developing such systems.

House Bans ASAT Tests

PH011641 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "House of Representatives Decision"]

[Text] Washington, 28 Jun -- The U.S. Congress House of Representatives has adopted a decision to ban the Defense Department from carrying out the final tests on antisatellite weapons -- tests which envisage the destruction of targets inserted into orbit. The ban is formulated in an amendment to the draft law on the military budget for the next fiscal year.

In the course of discussion of this amendment many congressmen acknowledged the need to prevent the spread of the arms race to space. They called on the White House to conduct serious talks with the Soviet Union on the question of a ban on antisatellite weapons. The legislators noted that the creation of lethal new types of arms has not in the past helped to strengthen U.S. national security. On the contrary, every new spiral in the arms race makes peace more fragile and brings mankind closer to nuclear catastrophe.

The House of Representatives decision was adopted on the eve of the first test announced by the Pentagon of an antisatellite system intended to hit a specific target in space. The military department has already conducted several tests on various components of the system, including tests in flight.

Earlier the Senate voted for the implementation of the final stage in the tests of antisatellite weapons in space, stipulating that the administration must, however, display "readiness" to achieve the conclusion of an agreement to ban these weapons. The question is now subject to discussion in the Conference Committee of Congress.

CSO: 5200/1039

TASS REPORTS PUGWASH CONFERENCE ON SPACE MILITARIZATION

Conference Opens

LD041405 Moscow TASS in English 0932 GMT 4 Jul 85

[Text] Campinas (Brazil) Jul 4 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Bespalko reporting:

The 25th Pugwash Conference opened here with scientists from 40 countries participating. They will discuss efforts to promote peace and international security, curb the nuclear arms race and prevent militarization of outer space. They will also consider Latin American problems, making emphasis on the situation in Central America. Since the time atomic weapons were produced, says a message from the United Nations secretary general, Javier Perez de Cuellar, the prevention of a thermonuclear conflict remains the chief task of mankind. This is why the activities of the Pugwash movement, which has been working consistently for peace and disarmament over the 30 years of its existence, remain important and timely today.

Addressing the conference, president of the Pugwash movement Professor Dorothy Hodgkin said that the year of the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism should be marked by scaled-up efforts of scientists to prevent nuclear war.

Conference Closes

LD091739 Moscow TASS in English 1627 GMT 9 Jul 85

[Text] Campinas July 9 TASS -- The 35th Pugwash conference has closed here. The conference centered on the need to prevent the spread of the arms race to outer space. The statement by the Pugwash Council on the results of the conference mirrors the view of the participants that the attempts at implementing the programme for strategic anti-missile defence with space based elements is conducive to a further build-up of the arms race and a growth of the threat of nuclear war.

The statement stresses that the developments make it even more necessary for the NATO nuclear powers to commit themselves not to be the first to use the nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union is known to make unilaterally such a commitment. The document points out the need for the speediest conclusion of a treaty on an end to all nuclear weapons tests.

The Pugwash Council has expressed the wish that the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, and President Ronald Reagan of the USA in November this year should bring about an improvement of mutual relations between the USSR and the USA and a lessening of international tensions.

The participants in the conference have expressed deep concern about the aggravation of the conflict situation in Central America, especially in connection with the foreign support for the Nicaraguan "contras" and urged the governments to support not by words but in action the efforts of the Contadora Group aimed at a peaceful settlement.

TASS STRESSES WIDE RANGE OF SDI-RELATED PROGRAMS

Gen Abrahamson Cited

LD081646 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT 8 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow July 8 TASS -- By TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev:

The Washington administration is busy developing new types of nuclear weapons for use as elements of space-based anti-missile defences, according to the American newspaper BALTIMORE SUN. The paper reports that President Reagan signed late in May a secret directive of the National Security Council, envisaging the development of a high-capacity laser powered by a hydrogen bomb explosion in outer space. According to THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper, research in this area is being conducted at a high pace. THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper reports that a two-million watt laser will soon be tested at the missile testing range of White Sands, New Mexico, in accordance with the Pentagon's plan of designing high-powered lasers. Another laser, of a five million watt capacity, is being built.

General James Abrahamson, who is in charge of the implementation of the "star wars" project, admitted in an article published by the Italian newspaper TEMPO that production of prototype electromagnetic rail guns, featuring an extremely high velocity of firing, will soon be started. Work is also under way on developing other types of weapons.

All this, the general put it, is only a tip of the iceberg of work under the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) programme. The "iceberg" becomes conspicuous against the background of the constant growth of allocations to the Pentagon. During the first four years of Reagan's presidency, allocations to the U.S. Defence Department exceeded 1,007,900,000,000 dollars. During the last year of Carter's presidency the U.S. military budget stood at 160 billion dollars, while at present, it amounts to roughly 300 billion. Spending on nuclear weapons grew fastest, nearly trebling since 1980. And against the background of these data Washington leaders still hypocritically assure the world that they are more than any one else interested in arms control.

According to American disarmament experts William Arkin and Richard Fieldhouse, only two U.S. states out of fifty do not have large facilities of the American "nuclear infrastructure", while 677 such facilities are situated in forty foreign countries. Within the framework of this infrastructure, the U.S. Administration is rapidly building up new strategic arms, creating new nuclear systems and continuing to deploy Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe. It also intends increasing the arsenal of nuclear munitions by 17,000 units. This is no iceberg, but a "nuclear

Everest" created by the Washington administration within the framework of the "star wars" programme.

In words, Washington declares its desire to restrict nuclear armaments; in fact, however, it is building up at a high pace new types of weapons, including space-based strike systems.

20 Corporations Involved

LD091608 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 9 Jul 85

[Text] New York July 9 TASS -- More than 20 big American corporations, the Pentagon's contractors, are engaged in developing various systems of space weapons and the strategy of their most effective use, reports the journal DISSENT. Among them are such giants of the military-industrial complex as TRW, Rockwell International, Lockheed, and General Research. Work is vigorously under way to develop ground and space-based laser weapons, beam weapons at the scientific-research centres of the military-industrial complex in Los Alamos, the Livermore Lawrence Radiation Laboratory and the Charles Stark Draper Laboratory. Besides, the American Defence Preparedness Association, which is engaged in questions of distribution of military contracts, made a long list of corporations which are interested in and have the necessary technology for creation of new types of space weapons.

The journal believes the expenditures for the research work to develop an anti-missile defence system with space-based elements alone will cost almost 52,000 million dollars, but not 26,000 million dollars as the administration asserts. The cost of the whole "star wars" program will exceed a trillion dollars.

Reagan's "star wars" program, DISSENT points out, is the program of hitting the first nuclear strike since it is a component part of the American nuclear strategy which is targetted above all at the use of nuclear weapons in offensive purposes.

The journal expresses confidence that realization of the White House's plans of creating a new broad-scale anti-missile defence system with space-based elements will lead to a new extremely dangerous round of the arms race, still greater stockpiling of destructive systems of nuclear weapons.

CSO: 5200/1039

USSR GENERAL ON PENTAGON'S NUCLEAR WAR SCENARIO

PM040910 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Jul 85 Second Edition p 3

[Major General A. Fedorov article: "What Lies Behind the Publicity; The Truth About the U.S. Program for the Militarization of Space"]

[Text] The U.S. Administration is building up a propaganda campaign distorting the genuine goals of the program for the militarization of space. Hypocritically termed the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) in Washington, this program is presented as virtually a panacea against nuclear missile arms -- the race in which, it is apposite to note, was unleashed and has been whipped up by U.S. ruling circles themselves. "The Strategic Defense Initiatives," the U.S. President assures us, "are aimed at ultimately eliminating the threat posed by ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads." Defense Secretary C. Weinberger went even further, claiming that the large-scale ABM system being developed in the United States is "in no way a weapons system," and that "SDI is not an arms race, not an arm, nor even a weapon. It is a harmless means of destroying weapons."

Why did the White House need all this propaganda ballyhoo, which THE WASHINGTON POST accurately defined as deception? What is Washington really planning as it trumpets so-called "strategic defense"?

To get an answer to these questions one need only look at the structure of the U.S. Armed Forces and the assignment, role, and place of the individual branches and components in them. As is well known, Washington gives pride of place in its plans for a universal nuclear war to the strategic nuclear forces, including offensive forces and strategic defensive forces, as well as the corresponding control and communications systems. The combat use of strategic offensive forces -- ground- and sea-launched intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM's and SLBM's) and strategic aircraft -- is envisaged only in coordination with the strategic defensive forces and according to a unified plan. In this connection the Pentagon is constantly seeking ways of increasing the effectiveness of the strategic defensive forces and their role in a nuclear war, above all in inflicting a first nuclear strike.

The idea of the coordinated utilization of strategic offensive and defensive weapons systems was proclaimed by the Pentagon back in the late fifties.

In the early sixties it was embodied the officially adopted strategic concept of "damage control." This concept envisaged inflicting a massive preemptive nuclear strike using ICBM's submarines, and strategic aircraft against targets on Soviet territory — primarily its strategic nuclear forces — while simultaneously using ABM systems to intercept with antimissile missiles the surviving Soviet missiles launched in a retaliatory strike. That was the Washington strategists' scheme for resolving a dual task — "guaranteeing the destruction" of the Soviet Union and at the same time "controlling the damage" inflicted on the United States. In line with these directives the United States carried out work in the sixties on the Sentinel and Safeguard ABM systems as well as massively deploying ground- and sea-launched ballistic missiles.

Subsequently, taking account of the extremely dangerous consequences for the country linked with the race in the sphere of ABM arms, Washington was forced to recounce its plans for the deployment of a territorial ABM system. In 1972 it concluded the open-ended Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems.

However, the U.S. military-political leadership did not entirely abandon the "damage control" concept, and intensive work continued in the sphere of the development of new ABM means. It did not abandon the intention of acquiring unilateral military advantages either, and to that end the Pentagon pushed ahead in the seventies with the deployment of MIRVed strategic missiles and the equipping of bombers with strike missiles. The hopes of obtaining superiority over the USSR in terms of the numbers of nuclear munitions on strategic delivery vehicles were illusory, however. The Soviet Union, through its own retaliatory measures, did not allow the prevailing strategic parity to be upset.

The notorious SDI trumpeted by the current U.S. administration is not just a return to the militarist venture of the early sixties. Now Washington has conceived the idea of obtaining an "absolutely reliable" large-scale ABM system with space-based elements and at the same time creating space strike forces. Supplementing and organically combined with the current and particularly the future U.S. strategic offensive first-strike nuclear means, this system, in the opinion of its creators, would allow the United States to ultimately acquire the capacity for "assured destruction" of the Soviet Union by means of a surprise nuclear strike, not just to reduce the damage inflicted on the United States by a retaliatory strike from the other side to an "acceptable level." An unrealizable dream of entirely ruling out the possibility of such a strike is being nurtured.

How does the Pentagon view the new nuclear war scenario? In its authors' scheme, the United States, hiding behind a space shield, carries out a surprise attack on the USSR, using only part of its strategic and medium-range nuclear weapons systems to start with. These would primarily be the highly accurate MX ICBM, the Trident II (D-5), the Pershing II medium-range missiles, and also the space strike systems. They are counting, as they put it in the United States, on "decapitating" (disabling the organs of state and supreme military leadership) and "disarming" the enemy (destroying a considerable proportion of his strategic nuclear forces, other military targets, and targets of military-industrial potential). At the same time, antisatellite complexes would be brought into play to disable Soviet space systems for warning of a nuclear missile attack.

The large-scale echeloned ABM system is tasked with intercepting in flight all surviving Soviet strategic means launched in a retaliatory strike against the aggressor. As a result, the Washington strategists think, they would be able to fully deprive the USSR of retaliatory weapons and "eliminate it as a viable society" without any damage to the United States. Moreover, the aggressor would retain a considerable proportion of his strategic offensive forces for inflicting subsequent nuclear strikes with a view to "preventing the Soviet Union from restoring its military-economic potential" and as a means of blackmail and coercion against other "potential enemies."

This insane scenario alone shows that the notorious "strategic defense" is conceived by no means as an alternative to nuclear arms, which is what Washington figures are trying to assure their population and allies in NATO and the other military-political blocs. Space arms are allotted the role of one of the most important components in a unified complex of interconnected first-strike nuclear weapons systems. The systems being created in the United States for waging "star wars" are not some kind of "harmless means," but qualitatively new and extremely dangerous types of arms meant for starting a nuclear war and making it even more destructive. At the same time, these systems would be a kind of detonator with which the U.S. Administration could bring into play the nuclear weapons arsenals that have already been amassed and continue to be amassed.

The U.S. plans for the militarization of space are coordinated with the programs being implemented and the future programs for the deployment in the United States of the latest strategic nuclear weapons systems. By the end of this decade alone the Pentagon proposes deploying 100 MX ICBM's carrying 1,000 nuclear warheads, obtaining 100 B-1B bombers capable of carrying up to 3,000 nuclear bombs on one mission, commissioning an additional 5-6 Ohio class nuclear missile submarines, which can deliver around 1,200 warheads to targets in the form of Trident I (C-4) and Trident II (D-5) missiles, completing the planned delivery of the forces of more than 900 Pershing II missiles, and acquiring several thousand air-, ground-, and sea-launched cruise missiles. In the nineties it is also planned to commission over 1,700 Midgetman ICBM's -- the latest strategic nuclear weapon delivery system -- Trident II SLBM's, and ATB (Stealth) bombers and deploy the new generation of long-range cruise missiles with all branches of the Armed Forces.

Washington's plan to create an "impenetrable" ABM shield over the United States is subordinated to the adventurist scheme of acquiring the capacity to use with impunity the aforesaid enormous arsenal of strategic offensive arms, which -- and this is particularly important -- it is planned to supplement with new space-based strike means. Although it is painstakingly covered up by Washington figures, this is the true essence of the program for the militarization of space. The creation of the latest types of weapons is intended to destroy entire countries and peoples.

The extremely dangerous consequences with which the implementation of the "star wars" program is fraught are even recognized by sober-minded people in the West, including the United States. Former U.S. Defense Secretary R. McNamara (who once formulated the aforesaid "damage control" concept based on an ABM system and subsequently abandoned it) stresses: "The idea that nuclear weapons or just ballistic missiles can be made powerless by means of science and technology is illusory." The British newspaper FINANCIAL TIMES notes that the SDI is leading to a "double arms race on an absolutely unprecedented scale in the sphere not only of offensive arms but also of defensive arms."

The Soviet Union's position is well known. It does not strive to obtain any unilateral advantages over the United States, but it will not permit the other side to achieve military-strategic superiority over it either. Our goal is not the arms race but ending it and completely eliminating nuclear weapons everywhere. There is one path to this: The United States must abandon its foolhardy plans to accelerate the arms race and transfer it to the new sphere of space and give up its attempts at the Geneva talks to impose an unacceptable agreement on the Soviet Union which would clear the way for the implementation of the nuclear and space military programs being planned by Washington. "If our partners in the Geneva talks," Comrade M.S. Gorbachev stated, "continue their line of temporizing at the delegations' meetings, avoiding solutions to the questions for which they have assembled, and using this time to push ahead with their military programs -- in space, on earth, and at sea -- we, of course, will have to assess the entire situation anew. We simply cannot allow talks to be used once again as a diversion and camouflage for military preparations whose goal is to ensure U.S. strategic superiority and world domination."

SOVIET ADMIRAL ATTACKS SDI, STRESSES DETERRENCE

PMO21418 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 85 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Admiral A. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate: "Washington's 'Space' Maneuvers"]

[Text] Saving the planet for present and future generations and preventing a nuclear missile catastrophe are the key problem of the present day. If this problem is being successfully resolved in one way or another despite the very acute confrontation between the two opposing social systems and if the U.S. ruling circle's long-standing plans for a nuclear attack against the USSR have not been realized, that is simply because the Soviet Union promptly eliminated U.S. imperialism's monopoly of weapons of mass destruction and, together with the fraternal socialist countries, created and firmly maintains the military-strategic equilibrium between the USSR and the United States, the Warsaw Pact and NATO, and socialism and imperialism. That balance of forces, which ensures the sides' equality and identical security, is the reliable foundation of peace and the peoples' security.

The inevitability of crushing retaliation holds potential aggressors in check. It stops them from succumbing to the temptation to rain arsenals of lethal weapons down on the heads of refractory countries and peoples. Therefore, to protect the military-strategic equilibrium, depriving the other side of equal security, achieving military superiority and then dictating terms, settling scores with dissenters, and establishing systems in the world that are to militarism's liking -- that is what obsesses the Washington ringleaders and their European sympathizers day and night, that is what they are striving to achieve.

Having seen that the equilibrium existing within the framework of agreements cannot be upset by a quantitative buildup of modern armaments and that the Pentagon's attempts to achieve military superiority are immediately answered by adequate Soviet measures, the United States set itself the goal of ending equal security by another means -- by "disabling" retaliatory strike weapons and disarming the other side. Washington decided to trample the accords reached on limiting ABM and missile armaments and break the military-strategic parity by means of space strike armaments, the program for which is called the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), as though in mockery of common sense.

The implementation of this program (costing trillions of dollars) needs the corresponding international and domestic public support. That is why the U.S. Administration is using all the mass media and setting its entire propaganda machine in motion in a vain attempt to make the "star wars" program, if not actually popular, then at least attractive and, above all, at all costs to conceal the grim truth about it from mankind. That is why the SDI apologists are making more and more new propaganda maneuvers in order to deceive the peoples.

Washington's planned "space shield" is presented as a manifestation of the Reagan administration's exceptional love of peace, as the last word in delivering mankind from the threat of nuclear nightmare, and as the means which will "reverse the arms race" and make nuclear weapons "impotent" and "obsolete." In an interview in THE WASHINGTON TIMES the U.S. defense secretary even went so far as to say the "SDI is not an arms race, nor arms, nor even weapons. It's a harmless means of destroying weapons."

What a distortion of the truth the leader of the U.S. military department is capable of descending to! As the incumbent of that post he cannot fail to realize that any means of struggle capable of affecting the correlation of forces counts as a weapon.

Space weapons can be described as "not weapons" only out of ignorant naivete or total military incompetence. If Washington is trying to suggest to the public that space-based ABM complexes are a "harmless means" and a panacea against the horrors of nuclear war, it is doing that solely to mislead the unenlightened, to present black as white, and to extort billions and billions of dollars for its latest reckless ventures in the illusory hope of delivering a first nuclear missile strike against the USSR and its allies with impunity.

The U.S. Administration's arguments circulated in the West regarding the "high moral aspect" of defensive weapons systems are also groundless. Mindful of the dialectical unity and constant struggle between offensive and defensive weapons and desiring to create a powerful barrier to the arms race, above all the nuclear missile race, the Soviet Union concluded the open-ended ABM Limitation Treaty with the United States in 1972. That was a great triumph for reason. The vicious circle whereby advances in defensive weapons spurred on advances in offensive weapons and vice versa was broken. The ABM Treaty made the signing of the SALT II treaty possible. The limitation of ABM systems determined the limits of missile systems.

The Pentagon does not consider it immoral to break that barrier by creating space arms, to open a Pandora's box with regard to missile limitations, and burden the peoples with a new and unprecedented arms race. It is no coincidence that in addition to the SDI program, the U.S. Administration is trying to undermine the SALT II treaty, gradually crawl out of its framework, and cast aside one strategic arms limitation after another. That is eloquently demonstrated in particular by President R. Reagan's recent statement on U.S. policy with regard to existing agreements.

Nor does Washington consider it immoral to throw further trillions of dollars into the bottomless barrel of preparing for war at a time when millions of people in the world are dying of hunger and disease and when mankind is increasingly sharply confronted with ecological problems and problems of resources.

There is an objective interdependence between arms in space and on earth. That is why the USSR is striving to ensure that the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva strictly observe the prior understanding that the aim of the talks is to prevent an arms race in space and halt it on earth. The two must be resolved as an interconnected whole. Any other approach is contrary to the principle of the sides' equality and identical security.

However, the U.S. side is adopting another stance. Its essence is perfectly clear: the blatant sabotaging of the examination and resolution of the question of preventing an arms race in space and an attempt to force through and legalize Washington's program for the accelerated militarization of space by any means.

Nor do Washington's arguments that the notorious "SDI" program is purely of research significance and that it will not necessarily be implemented stand up to criticism.

When has it ever happened that the imperialists, who know how to count every last cent, suddenly decided to waste billions of dollars merely to satisfy their "curiosity"? Practice itself shows that research into the "star wars" program has already reached the stage of testing a whole range of elements of space strike weapons. For example, during a recent flight by the Discovery space shuttle tests were carried out of a laser device whose technology it is planned will provide the basis for the very latest beam weapon systems that are being created.

It is not simply for research that the Pentagon is formulating a new doctrine which combines a nuclear "sword" with an ABM "shield." As THE NEW YORK TIMES has written: "The plan is to combine the forces and operations of the Air Force Strategic Air Command, Navy ballistic missile submarine, and submarines and surface ships armed with cruise missiles with the new unified Space Command and NORAD."

If, as Washington claims, the SDI is just a research program, why accustom people to the idea of the inevitability and necessity of waging "star wars"? Such propaganda is even promoted by game machines in the United States, which psychologically prepare both children and adults for the future use of space weapons. The Washington administration is going all out to publicize what it claims as the expected upsurge of a wave of innovations in the civilian economy as a result of research on the "star wars" program. The very idea that it is possible to achieve a leading position in technology by means of military research is, to put mildly, highly dubious -- from the social, economic, and moral viewpoints.

No matter what militarist initiatives the United States takes, it always tries to justify them by citing the myth of the "Soviet military threat." That pathetic argument is being used as the basis for the "SDI" program, too. A U.S. State Department report distributed recently claims that the Soviet Union has for over 20 years been making the most diverse efforts in the strategic defense sphere, that the USSR possesses the world's only large-scale [razvernuty] ABM system, and that unless "countermeasures" are taken the Soviet defensive potential will undermine the effectiveness of America's deterrent. If the uninitiated read these malicious fabrications, they might think that it is not Washington but Moscow that is preparing "star wars."

The talk about the U.S. "star wars" program's "defense" character and the creation of strike space weapons is, of course, pure fairytales intended for the gullible. The intention is to try to paralyze the Soviet Union's strategic weaponry and secure the potential for a nuclear strike against our country with impunity. That is the essence of the question and the USSR cannot ignore it.

"If the Soviet Union is faced with a real threat from space," Comrade M.S. Gorbachev stated at the meeting with the collective of the G.I. Petrovskiy Metallurgical Plant in Dnepropetrovsk, "it will find an effective means of countering that threat -- I say this quite clearly, let no one doubt that. One thing is now clear: The U.S. space militarization program serves as a blank wall barring the way to the achievement of the appropriate accords in Geneva."

The infamous "SDI" is a deception of both the Americans and the peoples of other countries. However, the world is becoming increasingly aware of the danger facing mankind. There is no people in the world who are not alarmed by the U.S. plans for the militarization of space and that alarm is well founded. The implementation of those plans would sharply increase the threat of a truly global, all-destroying military conflict.

The Soviet people and their servicemen respond to this real threat by showing even greater cohesion around the CPSU Central Committee and the Soviet Government, increasing their vigilance and labor and political activeness, strengthening discipline, organization, and order, and strengthening the motherland's economic and defense might.

The CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum emphasized that we will continue to make every effort to ensure that the USSR Armed Forces have everything necessary to reliably defend our fatherland and its allies and ensure that no one catches us unawares.

The preparation for the 27th CPSU Congress gives us a new surge of strength, energy, and enthusiasm. Developing socialist competition among troops and fleets, military councils, commanders, political workers, and the party and Komsomol aktiv inspire personnel to scale the heights in strengthening the Soviet Armed Forces' combat potential that are required by the threat of a new world war, which has increased through the fault of imperialism's aggressive circles. Much has been done in that sphere, but life demands considerably more. We have quite a few urgent problems but we also have great reserves for resolving them. We must now resolve many questions in a new way.

The party teaches that the resolution of complex tasks is inconceivable without profound changes in organizational and party political work dealing with the decisive factor in all changes -- the human factor. That also applies fully to solving the tasks of military building. The duty of political organs and party organizations is to increase in every possible way military cadres' responsibility in all spheres of ministry activity, to prevent complacency and carelessness, and to focus all attention on the most important thing -- readiness at all times to resolutely rebuff the aggressor.

CSO: 5200/1043

USSR: SUCCESS FOR FRENCH EUREKA PROJECT DUBIOUS

LD092327 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1842 GMT 9 Jul 85

[From the "World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Text] I would like to dwell in some detail on the French project Eureka. Incidentally some television viewers have asked about this in their letters. This project has evoked great discussion in Western Europe. The concrete details of the project are not yet quite clear. According to the British paper GUARDIAN, Eureka is the most ambitious and hazy fruit of the reveries of European politicians.

It is well known that the United States is trying by all means to draw its West European NATO allies into the realization of the adventurous "star wars" program. The Pentagon strategists are particularly trying to gather round those Western firms which are working on advanced technology; they are trying to lure them with orders worth millions. However, the most soberminded politicians of the Old World are aware of the serious consequences of this. For the inclusion of modern technology from the FRG, Britain, and certain other countries in the space ventures across the ocean among other things threatens to turn Western Europe into the U.S. technological backwoods, as is now being said abroad.

The Eureka project proposed by French President Mitterrand can be considered the fruit of thoughts of this kind. The project came into the world, it is reported, as the result of deep dissatisfaction on the part of France with Reagan's notorious Strategic Defense Initiative, and as an alternative to this plan of Reagan's.

Eureka proposes to unite the efforts of West European countries in fields of some of the newest branches of industry, technology, and science, under a European flag, so to speak. The aim of this, so Mitterrand said, is to preserve a fund of knowledge, technology, and brains. As a result of its realization, advocates of the French project hope, Western Europe will acquire its own united scientific-industrial potential. They are crumbs from the American table, in the words of one French paper. At the same time it will be able to overcome its technological lagging in the competitive battle with the United States and Japan. At the recent Milan session of EEC heads of state and government, Mitterrand submitted to his partners a whole series of specific proposals in the framework of the Eureka project. Lasers, optics, and electronics, which as we know are becoming the leading elements of modern weapons, are an important element in these proposals.

In the field of information the so-called europmatic [as heard] program is proposed, which envisages a number of specific projects, including a project for the creation of a superpowerful numerical computer, which would be capable of carrying out more than 10 billion operations per second. Also proposed is the joint designing of supercomputers, the development of high-capacity memory units, artificial intellect, and so on.

At present in West European capitals there are few people who would undertake to assess the chances of realization of all these ambitious schemes. It's possible that it is worth recalling the protracted attempts, lasting 5 years, by West European countries, France, Britain, Italy, Spain, and West Germany, to create a modern joint military aircraft ended in failure.

It is reported that West European interest in the Eureka project is growing. Support for this program in varying degrees has been expressed by the abovementioned five countries, and also Belgium, Norway, Portugal, and Austria. However, despite this, on the whole international observers assess the chances of Eureka rather sceptically. The French project has been conceived as the path for achieving the industrial and scientific-technological integration of West European countries. However, it will certainly also intensify the imperialist contradictions among them, not to mention the fact that attempts to realize the project will certainly result in another sharp clash of imperialist interests within the framework of the already global capitalist rivalry; I mean the United States, Japan and Western Europe.

CSO: 5200/1043

TASS CITES SPACE CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS IN STOCKHOLM

LD051704 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 5 Jul 85

[Text] Stockholm July 5 TASS — TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov and Aleksandr Yevdokimov report:

"Space arms and international security," such is the topic of a representative international conference which opened at Saltsjobaden, not far from the Swedish capital.

Inaugurating the conference on behalf of the Swedish Government, minister at the Ministry of Industry (Energy), Birgitta Dahl pointed to the necessity of preventing a new round of arms race in space which threatens the entire system of international security. Noting great importance of observing the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems in the present conditions, Birgitta Dahl emphasized special significance of the agreement reached between the USSR and USA in January that problems of preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth be discussed at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva. The hopes that reliable security can be ensured through technological development are a dangerous illusion, the Swedish minister said.

One of high officials of the U.S. Department of Defence, Frank Gaffney, addressing the plenary meeting tried to justify the United States "Strategic Defence Initiative" and the efforts of the U.S. Administration to develop that program, making reference to the information, which is not in keeping with reality, that the USSR is ahead of the United States in the sphere. Contrary to obvious facts he asserted that the "SDI" program does not lead to the violation of the ABM Limitation Treaty.

The head of the Soviet delegation Academician Yevgeniy Velikhov emphasized in his speech in this connection that the "Strategic Defence Initiative" is one of the most important elements of creating the potential of first-strike weapons which it is now sought to spread to outer space.

The implementation of that program will give an impetus to a fresh spiral of the arms race and to the emergency of ever more dangerous types of arms. All this contradicts the spirit and letter of the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems which is a corner stone in the entire process of arms limitation and ensurance of strategic stability. This is why it is now important as never before that, as the Soviet Union suggests, an arms race in space be prevented, and that the nuclear arms be reduced substantially till they are eliminated completely.

The head of the Indian delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Conference, Ambassador N. Dubey said in his speech that the assertions of representatives of the U.S. Administration that the SDI program has a nature of research are hypocrisy. New dangerous types of arms are actually being created now. Therefore, the implementation of the U.S. plans will lead to the destabilization of the situation in the world which poses a threat to all countries and peoples.

SOVIET OBSERVER STRESSES SDI IMPACT ON GENEVA TALKS

PM081340 Moscow SEL'SKAYA 'ZHIZN in Russian 6 Jul 85 p 3

[Political observer Spartak Beglov "View of Events": "The Question of Questions"]

[Text] The development of East-West relations and the progress of the Geneva talks on space and nuclear arms, just like any other event in Soviet-U.S. relations, is invariably at the center of the international public's attention. There is no people who want a war, just as there is no sensible alternative to peaceful coexistence. The only way out is to strive to ensure that the norm is not confrontation but cooperation among states for the sake of a common peaceful future.

In this connection, the particular interest with which the report of the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva in November was greeted worldwide is understandable. People are not indifferent to whether relations between the two great powers take a turn for the better or whether international tension and the arms race will continue to whip each other up.

Ending this insane race is the question of questions in world politics. The international public pays tribute to the Soviet Union for the efforts which our country is making to clear the way for mutually acceptable agreements in this sphere. In the interests of creating the most favorable conditions for the Geneva talks, the USSR has proposed as a start halting the further buildup of arms and has proposed that the USSR and the United States introduce a moratorium on the creation -- including scientific research work, testing, and deployment -- of strike space arms for the entire period of the Geneva talks and that the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles and the buildup of our retaliatory measures be ended. Moreover, the Soviet Union has already unilaterally introduced a moratorium until this November on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and on the other aforesaid retaliatory measures. It must be stated that these proposals have not yet been reciprocated. Moreover, the process of the Geneva talks themselves has hit a kind of blank wall.

When last week an authoritative Soviet statement made an impartial assessment of the U.S. stance at the talks, official Washington diplomacy decided to strike an "offended" pose. The U.S. State Department hastened to term this assessment "distorted" and to accuse the Soviet side of "unilaterally striving to impose preliminary conditions" -- no more, no less. This is a reference to close interconnection between the nonmilitarization of space and the reduction of nuclear arsenals, an interconnection which is consistently defended by the Soviet Union.

I can foresee readers' perplexed questions. How did the organic interconnection between preventing an arms race in space and ending it on earth turn into a "unilateral" condition? Does it not stem from the preliminary joint USSR-U.S. understanding on the subject matter and goals of the Geneva talks?

This sense of perplexity is justified, just as the fact of the aforesaid understanding expressed in the Soviet-U.S. joint statement of 7-8 January this year is incontrovertible. "So much the worse for the facts" is obviously the opinion of some people in Washington, but the rest of the world is by no means indifferent to whether the United States prefers the arms race or talks about disarmament.

This is the moment of a "split" in U.S. policy. Some of its representatives do not tire of assuring the general public of the "serious U.S. approach to arms control talks." Others operate as "fixers" for the plan to create strike space weapons, depicting for the NATO partners and Japan various tempting types of participation in this fantastic scheme, which is at the same time unprecedented in its dangerous consequences. U.S. Vice President George Bush has spent almost 2 weeks on another tour of West European capitals trying to win over to the "star wars" program leaders on this side of the Atlantic. But even from some of the most loyal and faithful allies he has at best encountered only polite attention or heard entirely noncommittal replies.

J. Delors, chairman of the EC Commission, openly hinted to the lofty U.S. guest that, if Washington was hoping to get a collective "yes" from the West Europeans, the "Common Market" leadership does not have the power to give such an answer.

Of course, there are also figures in the NATO capitals who would prefer not to enter the door opened by Washington in full public view, but rather to "creep into" the program for the militarization of space while U.S. politicians are seeking ways of "creeping" unnoticed out of the restrictions laid down by the ABM and SALT II treaties and out of the disarmament process as a whole. Most of the U.S. allies, however, prefer to take a cautious stance first and foremost out of a fear of leaving in U.S. hands a monopoly of control over the development of new technology and of opening the floodgates for a drain of scientific talent to the United States. "We are being told to get on a train headed into the unknown," a NATO politician said.

Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme, who stated last week at an international colloquium in Geneva that the ruinous nuclear arms race which threatens to spread even to space may ultimately lead to a universal catastrophe, pointed out the "destination" of this "train" much more accurately. In his opinion, the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative will not only fail to lead to the elimination of nuclear arms but, on the contrary, will be a new contribution to the accumulation of nuclear arsenals.

If there is one thing that almost all West European politicians are unanimous about, it is that the "star wars" plan embodies a deadly threat to the Geneva talks. As for the West European general public, it demands that a resolute end be put to the adventurist scheme to militarize space. It was in this spirit that a protest letter was drawn up by the mass antiwar organization "campaign for nuclear disarmament" in Britain for presentation to U.S. Vice President G. Bush, Washington's envoy.

Suddenly it occurred to U.S. supporters of the militarization of space that there had been a "mistake" at the very birth of the President's program -- it had been given the wrong name! "The term 'star wars,'" Professor Edward Teller, who has the reputation of being "father of the U.S. hydrogen bomb," stated in a speech in Paris, was, it seems, "dreamed up by THE NEW YORK TIMES to 'cast aspersions' on the President's initiative."

It so happened that in the heat of polemics this atom-mongering scientist stated the plain truth without any academic or diplomatic ado. It turns out that the "initiative," as it is called, is fully compatible with the "parallel modernization of nuclear potential." According to his admission, all the qualities attributed to it of "being a wondrous means of saving the world from nuclear weapons" were needed purely to neutralize the antiwar movement (!). In this case, as the saying goes, comment is superfluous.

These revelations do, however, force us all the more to pose the question: Is a situation tolerable whereby Washington essentially exploits the Geneva talks as a diversion to cover up its military preparations? This conclusion is confirmed by more and more new studies of space weapons being expedited by the Pentagon on the pretext that the program is "unstoppable" and consequently "irreversible."

The Soviet side has repeatedly resolutely reminded the U.S. Administration of the need to correct the U.S. position on this question, especially as the United States has not put forward in Geneva any serious proposals for curtailing the arms race and the new U.S. programs are increasingly complicating such a curtailment.

What would happen if Washington adopted a more sensible position? The door would immediately be opened for mutually acceptable agreements on far-reaching and really radical reductions in nuclear weapons stockpiles by both sides. The way would be opened for the complete elimination of these weapons and the arms race would not acquire the uncontrollable nature threatened by its transfer into space. The hope of millions of people of removing the danger of nuclear war would become real.

Focusing all efforts on achieving this noble goal is the supreme duty of governments and responsible statesmen and their duty to present and future generations. The Soviet Union is invariably prepared to travel that road.

CSO: 3200/1049

MOSCOW WEEKLY TALK SHOW DISCUSSES SHUTTLE PROGRAM

LD052016 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1615 GMT 5 Jul 85

["International Situation--Questions and Answers" program presented by Pavel Kasparov, All-Union Radio foreign policy commentator, with Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS military-political observer, Edgar Cheporov, APN political observer, and Yuriy Vybornov, Gostele radio correspondent in Rome]

[Excerpts] [Kasparov] The reaching of serious accords obviously does not enter into the plans of official Washington, says Nikolay Lysenko of Kiev. It is stubbornly striving to implement its highly dangerous program for the militarization of space, which is rightly known throughout the world as "star wars." No small part in these plans, it appears, is devoted to the American space shuttle program. What is this program? Why is the Pentagon interested in it? We are asked about this in particular by Shaykhmurad Kurbanovich Manedov of Ashkhabad and Boris Alekseyevich Likhachev of Svetlogorsk in Kalinin Oblast. I have asked our guest Vladimir Nikolayevich Chernyshev, military-political observer of TASS, a colonel in the reserve, to answer these and many other such questions. Please proceed, Vladimir Nikolayevich.

[Chernyshev] The implementation of the space shuttle program began in the U.S. in 1969. The first orbital test flight of the spacecraft took place in April 1981, and the first flight for purely military purposes in January 1985. At present, the system includes three examples of the spacecraft: The Columbia, Challenger, and Discovery. This year a fourth one, the Atlanta, is due to come into service. The spacecraft are launched from a launching pad at the Kennedy Space Flight Center and the flights are controlled from Houston. It currently takes about 2 months to prepare for a flight. The ground complex of the system can handle 10 flights a year. The space shuttle system is expected to be in full operation toward the end of the eighties. By that time there should be three launching pads in operation, two at the Kennedy Space Flight Center and one at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California. The special launch and landing complex for military purposes at Vandenberg is due to be ready for use in October of this year. The U.S. Air Force has already spent almost \$3 billion on it. The Defense Department is currently also building a joint space operations center at Colorado Springs, Colorado. Inside Cheyenne Mountain in the same state, galleries have been dug to a depth of 500 meters and an Aerospace Defense Center is being built. It will have about 100 computers. This center comes under the Joint Space Command of the U.S. Armed Forces, which was set up in December of last year. According to the Pentagon's schemes, bringing the center into operation is intended to enable a check to be maintained on the situation in space and to enable the space shuttle to be used for military purposes.

The creation of the shuttle and the launching complex at Vandenberg Air Force Base, and of the Joint Center for Space Operations, comprises yet another proof of the growing militarization of the American space programs.

[Kasparov] Vladimir Nikolayevich, what can you say about the interest being shown in the space shuttle by the Pentagon recently? We are asked to talk about this, in particular by listener Andrey Svetlanov of Aktyubinsk, and also by some other comrades.

[Chernyshev] It must be said plainly that the Pentagon has a most tremendous interest in this program.

For many years the U.S. Defense Department has been putting into space a system intended to support combat operations: satellites for observation, reconnaissance, detecting missile launches, navigation, communications, meteorological satellites, and others. Now they are talking of space weapons to fulfill combat functions, in other words, a space-based strike weapon, intended to strike at targets both in space and on earth. To implement these plans, means are required to provide for a massive military penetration into space. The space shuttle provides just such a means, since these spacecraft, unlike conventional carrier rockets, can be repeatedly used to deliver military cargos into orbit around the earth. According to the calculations of the American specialists, whereas U.S. potential capacity to put military cargo into space by means of conventional carrier rockets has never been more than 20 metric tons annually, the introduction of the space shuttle will raise this capacity to 600 metric tons by the middle of the decade; this will enable the Pentagon to put a total of 3,000 metric tons of military cargo into space by the end of the decade. To use the words of one American scientist, reusable spacecraft are destined to be a sort of star taxi for the Pentagon.

However, apart from putting military satellites and space battle platforms into orbit, the Pentagon also intends to impose other tasks on the space shuttle spacecraft: the holding of experiments in developing both promising backup systems and weapons systems based in space; the assembly in space of space battle platforms, their servicing, repair, and refueling; intercepting and inspecting other people's satellites. The possibility of using these spacecraft as weapons carriers for destroying targets in space and making strikes at particularly important targets on earth is also being considered. Let us take, for example, the task of intercepting and inspecting other people's satellites. As the American press wrote recently, in peacetime the U.S. may limit itself purely to inspecting, in other words, studying Soviet satellites directly in orbit or in special centers, for which purpose they could be taken out of orbit and delivered to earth in the cargo compartment of the space shuttle.

[Kasparov] Vladimir Nikolayevich, how frequently, in your opinion, does the Pentagon intend to utilize the space shuttle spacecraft in the future?

[Chernyshev] In February of this year the U.S. President signed a special directive of the National Security Council on the utilization of this program for military purposes, thus legitimizing its military direction. The directive provides for handing over to the Pentagon at least a third of all launches of these spacecraft. Accordingly, the flight plan published recently in the U.S. shows that up to the end of 1987 it is intended to make 41 launches of the space shuttle, of which seven will be purely military. After 1988 the Pentagon will be using for its own purpose eight of the 24 flights planned for each year. Besides this, American officials admit that in case of necessity, further spacecraft will be put at the Pentagon's disposal at their first demand. There are already plans, up to the end of the present decade, for 15 totally secret flights.

Starting in 1987 it is planned to use spacecraft of the space shuttle series to make at least two major experiments, as the U.S. calls them, in the "star wars" program. Nor is that all. At the Pentagon's orders, plans are being worked out for piloted and pilotless spacecraft which will be able to be used both from earth and from space platforms or large transport aircraft. It is intended to use them to make strikes from space at terrestrial strategic targets, to solve problems in anti-missile defense, and so on. At the end of June, the latest flight of the spacecraft Discovery took place. This flight was the latest practical step in implementing the wide-scale program put forward by the U.S. Administration for the militarization of space. During Discovery's flight, the U.S. conducted tests of one of the possible components of an antimissile system with space-based elements. This was the whole point of the flight.

The possibility of using the rays of powerful ground-based lasers to destroy targets in space with the aid of space-based reflectors was investigated. A laser beam sent from a ground installation was reflected by a mirror on the spacecraft and was received at the ground installation again. The Pentagon and the leaders of the American "star wars" program attached tremendous significance to this experiment, considering it to be the first stage of still more expensive and complex space operations in using lasers and rockets. It is thus quite clear that the Discovery's flight demonstrated the ever closer tying of the space shuttle program to the so-called "star wars."

It is noteworthy that the crew of the American spacecraft were conducting this experiment, dangerous to the cause of peace, at the same time the Soviet cosmonauts Dzhanibekov and Savinykh were working in orbit around the earth on behalf of science and peace, and the Soviet automatic spacecraft Vega-1 and Vega-2 were helping to make important scientific discoveries on the planet Venus. It would really be difficult to find a more convincing proof of the opposite nature of the two approaches to space. The Soviet Union has always been and remains the opponent of any kind of "star wars." Its slogan is peace on earth and in space. But the U.S. Reagan Administration, pursuing a course for the militarization of space, is sacrificing the program for utilizing space peacefully. This policy cannot but arouse concern throughout the world, including in the U.S. itself.

[Kasparov] You are right, Vladimir Nikolayevich. We in the USSR are keeping a close eye on the schemes of the Pentagon. In this connection I would like to remind our listeners of the words of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, spoken in Dnepropetrovsk -- that the Soviet Union, if faced with a real threat from space, would find an effective means of counteraction. Let no one be in any doubt about this.

CSO: 5200/1043

SPACE ARMS

TASS REPORTS JAPANESE-AUSTRALIAN TALKS ON SDI PARTICIPATION

LD18101, Moscow TASS in English 1000 GMT 18 Jun 85

[Text] Tokyo June 18 TASS--TASS correspondent Vasiliy Golovnin reports:

Talks between the Foreign Minister of Japan Shintaro Abe and the Foreign Minister of Australia William Hayden that came to a close here were characterized by serious differences over Reagan's "star wars" program. According to an official communique, W. Hayden stressed Australia's refusal to support the notorious "strategic defense initiative". Earlier Canberra turned down Washington's "invitation" to join in the development of space weapons and other projects aimed at the militarization of outer space.

However, the Japanese foreign minister hurried to state that Tokyo, unlike Australia and many other countries, treated the U.S. program "with understanding". And still, he did not fail to mention that the Nakasone cabinet "had not yet worked out a final stand" on this problem.

However, it is well known that the Japanese Government has actually announced already its readiness to take part in the preparation of "star wars". Thus, private corporations were officially authorized to participate in the development of space weapons in the U.S. and to put at the disposal of the Pentagon for this purpose any technology it needed. Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone even said in parliament that with this in view Japan was ready to send to work in American laboratories the best scientists of the country.

The Japanese-Australian talks have shown that this zeal makes Tokyo ever more different even from many other allies of the United States. Japan's stand is at variance with the opinion of many Western governments. It is noteworthy that the end of W. Hayden's visit coincided with the publication in the newspaper YOMIURI of an interview of French Prime Minister Laurent Fabius. He said, among other things, that a whole number of West European NATO member states were assailed with serious doubts over the "star wars" program which was fraught with another outbreak of the arms race.

CSO: 5200/1041

SPACE ARMS

PS VIEWS FRENCH ROLE IN WEST EUROPE DEFENSE

PM051609 Paris LE MONDE in French 4 Jul 85 p 6

[Unattributed report: "PS Publishes 'Statement on Europe's Security'"]

[Excerpts] On Tuesday, 2 July, the PS published the text of a "Statement on Europe's Security," which had previously been adopted by its executive bureau and on which Jacques Huntzinger, member of the secretariat for international questions, is due to comment Thursday. We are publishing a few significant extracts from this long document.

The Strategic Defense Initiative

"Ultimately the Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] project poses the question of the guarantee of American security with regard to West Europe. It is important to realize that the possible deployment of new ABM systems would deal a blow not only to deterrence but also to the graduated response doctrine — NATO's official doctrine. Indeed the establishment of two defense systems over the United States and the USSR would further detach European defense from U.S. defense, in that Soviet ABM defense would make a selective, graduated, U.S. strike even more difficult and hence less credible, and would lead the two powers to view the use of their nuclear arsenal, which they can even less afford to squander, in strict terms of national interest. Strategic defense will not protect them completely from enemy strikes but will deter them a little more from using nuclear weapons for the benefit of other countries. Not completely, of course, but a little more. Thus, before it is even deployed, the SDI is dealing a major blow to the U.S.-European strategic link, the U.S. strategic weapons losing the ultimate deterrent function which they still have."

CSO: 5200/2685

NO UNITARY RESPONSE FROM FRG INDUSTRY TO SDI COOPERATION

Duesseldorf WIRTSCHAFTSWOCHE in German 31 May 85 pp 110-112

[Article: "Fear of SDI"]

[Text] The SDI armament program of the United States worries German industry. Afraid of an increase in the Americans' lead in technology, many Germans want to participate in the program with or without support from Bonn.

A magic number--26--is making the rounds in German industry. It is no less than \$26 billion that the U.S. Government wants to allot in the next 5 years to a program, commonly known by its acronym SDI, which is to serve the strategic defense of the country. What is behind this, as far as the Germans are concerned, is not just the thought that with a group of space satellites and a tight network of ground stations the Americans intend to intercept and destroy Soviet nuclear missiles while they are still in their starting phase.

Behind this defense system described as star wars, for a start, is a huge research and development program which will lend entirely new impetus to U.S. industry. In plain language this means that several enterprises engaged in high technology will receive an abundance of orders from the U.S. Government in the next few years.

But when U.S. President Ronald Reagan and his secretary of defense, Caspar W. Weinberger, invited the Europeans to take part in the military high-tech armament program, this also caused a stir among representatives of German industry, with many seeing a chance of fat orders. On behalf of the entire German air and space industry and its suppliers, its association hastened to announce that it definitely thought "that German firms can make substantial contributions to the SDI research program which will serve both the research objective and the development of technology as a whole."

Without qualification, some manufacturers also announced immediately that they wanted to participate if it came to German participation in the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI). Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm, for example, which with its air and space capacities is the German leader in questions of space, let it be known that "MBB is able and ready to participate in major technological programs such as SDI and also in other projects." In addition to MBB, AEG

[General Electric Company] set up an internal SDI study group, and other enterprises are considering similar steps. Only, "it is still not yet clear what SDI in fact amounts to," states the spokesman of the German air, space and equipment industry, Arno L. Schmitz.

There is one thing about which the representatives of the German high-tech branch of industry have no doubt. If the Americans will put the giant \$26 billion program into practice, "the technological gap between the United States and Europe is bound to increase," says one technology manager.

Bonn politicians do not know much more either. Last week, talks between 16 chiefs of major German enterprises and 9 representatives of important public and private research institutes with Wolfgang Schaeuble, minister at the Office of the Chancellor, provided hardly any greater insight. The only tangible result of the talks was that as early as June a 30-member delegation of leading industrialists and government personnel is to go to the United States to gather reliable data concerning the Strategic Defense Initiative.

But already during the Bonn talks the views of the industrial representatives diverged considerably. Some of them--for instance the managers from Brown, Boveri & Cie and AEG--indicated that they would prefer to offer their services to the Americans as suppliers of technology on a purely commercial basis, completely unaffected by any government plans.

Other firms are interested more in the formation of an industrial consortium under government supervision which would steer U.S. orders in the direction of the Federal Republic. But, chances are, this is something the Americans do not want any longer, U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger now having indicated that he is no longer waiting for a reply by the hesitating European governments to his offer of participation in SDI. The Americans now want to establish direct contact with possible industrial partners.

This is a development of which several representatives of German industry have been particularly afraid. They think that individual contracts between U.S. clients and German manufacturers may result in a unilateral flow of technology from Europe to the United States. "The individual is helpless," states a German industry representative who thinks that research capacities for German interests would be blocked at firms placing themselves in the service of the U.S. partner.

It has already leaked out from Bonn that MBB boss Hanns Arnt Vogels returned from a visit to the head of the U.S. SDI project, Gen James A. Abrahamson, with the impression that the United States wants to reserve certain technological areas for itself alone and rejects a technological two-way street in the case of SDI.

It has been the experience of German aerospace companies in the past that even in the case of firm promises the flow from the United States of research and development results has been entirely inadequate. In late January of this year already, this was reason enough for the research ministers of the countries belonging to the European Space Agency, ESA, to approve European participation in a manned U.S. space station only if the question of mutual transfer of technology has been settled unequivocally.

For this reason some representatives of German companies continue to hope that Bonn will quickly reach a clear decision for SDI and, if at all possible, will also take on tasks of coordination in order to provide support for the companies in negotiations with the Americans. Roland Mecklinger, member of the board of SEL [Standard Electric Lorenz], for example, is afraid that otherwise others will get into the SDI business. He says: "Whoever is not with it from the start will be dropped."

Meanwhile, after a long to and fro, Chancellor Kohl apparently is following his European-oriented foreign minister, Hans-Dietrich Genscher and is trying to pave the way for German industry both to participate in SDI and to be a party to Eureka--a project on which the French and German governments have been working for as long as a year and a half.

Hidden behind this name is a program, as yet of uncertain size, which is supposed coordinate and concentrate more efficiently the research funds and potentials in the Common Market countries. Particularly the French are hopeful of a promising technology push comparable to the SDI effect.

Publicly at this time no entrepreneur as yet dares give the government any further advice and estimate as to whether SDI or Eureka is better for the Germans. The only important point is that they receive more money in the future to prevent the headstart of the Americans from increasing out of all proportion. Everyone knows that the Europeans no longer can afford to do nothing at all.

The Turnabout Maneuver of Helmut Kohl

"Imagination has no bounds." This is how a high official of Hans-Dietrich Genscher's Foreign Ministry describes the debate about the U.S. SDI defense plan which has been going on for months. And it applies equally to the advocates and to the opponents of possible German participation. While particularly the government camp sees unheard-of possibilities of future technology, the whole thing according to former Research Minister Volker Hauff, in the opinion of the opposition is a "useless and expensive program" for which "money is being thrown out the window without any benefit to us."

In addition to the prophesied zero effect, the opposition fears the project will also torpedo any disarmament negotiation. In this it even enjoys the support of the smaller coalition partner, the FDP [Free Democratic Party]. "Space armament and a policy of detente are irreconcilable," says Foreign Minister Genscher.

Helmut Kohl's attitude, on the other hand, resembles a wavy line. While as recently as early February the chancellor had informed participants in the Munich military science congress that he fully supported the U.S. plans, French doubts caused him to draw back soon thereafter and to say that one would "first (have to) take a closer look." Finally he again fully supported President Reagan during his visit to Bonn, only to show reluctance again on the part of the FRG at the assembly of NATO parliamentarians in Stuttgart in the second half of May.

It is not clear what role the Americans had in mind for the Europeans in SDI and so it caused some amazement in Bonn when U.S. SDI chief Gen James A. Abrahamson let it be known that "because of the need for secrecy" European "participation in the research program would at best be limited."

Though the American NATO Embassy in Brussels quickly issued reassuring denials, the subject is not yet closed by any means. In his draft report to NATO parliamentarians, U.S. Congressman Robert E. Badham openly states that the United States "would insist on control measures exceeding the norm." He further says: "The United States has all along been unwilling to share the fruits of state-of-the-art technology with its European allies and potential competitors."

All along Paris had suspected that the Americans were less concerned about the development of know-how in Europe than about a silent financial partnership, and therefore had invited Bonn in particular to participate in the European (if at all possible French-led) Eureka research and defense project. To lend this sufficient emphasis, it was ready with a reprimand for the Federal chancellor. "Helmut Kohl," said French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas, "has turned away from the common European road."

According to statements by leading U.S. diplomats, Kohl is pledged to Ronald Reagan. This dilemma is being taken advantage of--not least for party reasons--by the foreign minister, who wants himself and the Free Democrats to be considered preservers of a dialogue with the Soviet Union, a country extremely irritated because of SDI. It is Genscher's hard luck that the French, desired as partners for European cooperation, are not playing along to the extent he shows overtly to believe they are. Where as France publically rejects SDI, French industrial delegations, certainly not without Paris consent, are visiting the United States looking for partners to cooperate with them in SDI.

For a start the Federal Government asked the Federal Intelligence Service to point up the potential and weaknesses of SDI. The result: "The prospects of the establishment of comprehensive U.S. protection against missiles are rather vague," and "even smaller are the chances of NATO Europeans being able to protect themselves against strategic offensive weapons."

8790

CSO: 5200/2667

ITALIAN DEFENSE INDUSTRY CREATES SDI RESEARCH GROUP

AU051948 Rome ANSA in English 1945 GMT 5 Jul 85

[Text] (ANSA) Rome, July 5 -- Within the context of strategic technologies for the future, along the line of the "star wars" program put forward by U.S. President Ronald Reagan, a number of the chief Italian defense industries today created a consortium to promote such research.

The "Consorzio Italiano per le tecnologie strategiche" ("CITES") was the brain child of the august group. Other companies which have joined in the venture are three private firms (Elettronica, Marconi Italiana and SMA) and companies of the EFIM group (Oto Melara, Galileo, Breda Meccanica Bresciana).

The purpose of "CITES" will be to create a valid Italian partner for the American program Strategic Defence Initiative without at the same time excluding the possible participation in the French-backed European program dubbed "Eureka." The consortium will develop research in the area of software for high-speed computers, radar, electro-optics and lasers, in the applications of infra-red light and in the development of a new generation of electronic components a communique said.

CSO: 5200/2685

SPACE ARMS

JPRS-TAC-85-021
30 July 1985

SPECIAL VATICAN ACADEMY FINDINGS ON SDI LEAKED

AU062016 Rome ANSA in English 1950 GMT 6 Jul 85

[Excerpt] (ANSA) Vatican City, July 6 -- The Pontifical Academy of the Sciences still has under study President Ronald Reagan's 26-billion-dollar Strategic Defense Initiative, the deputy director of the Vatican Press Office Msgr Giulio Nicolini, acknowledged today in response to press leaks on the findings of the academy's study of the five-year "star wars" missile defense system.

According to accounts appearing in today's editions of Italian dailies attributed to informed Vatican sources, a committee which included an Italian-American specialist, Eugenio Fubini, who is a Pentagon adviser, and a Soviet specialist in scientific issues connected to nuclear strategy, Ronald Segdeev, conducted a study of the SDI in a special academy session held January 21 through 24.

The findings as reported today were that: 1) the space-based missile defense system would require 10 to 15 years for completion; 2) the shield devised would not be 100 percent effective; 3) before the research and development for the defense system could be completed a "supermissile" capable of penetrating the shield could be built; 4) the cost of the "star wars" system would be about double that of the "supermissile." Therefore the question is raised of a huge commitment of scientific and financial resources to a missile defense system which would not provide a solid guarantee of defense.

CSO: 5200/2685

SPACE ARMS

SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL CONDEMNS STAR WARS

PM020919 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 20 Jun 85 p 9

[TIDNINGARNAS TELEGRAMBYRA report: "Socialist International Condemns "Star Wars") -

[Text] Sodertalje -- U.S. plans for the development of space defenses must be condemned. No country should take part in such plans.

International control of Nicaragua's borders is needed.

So said the Socialist International which yesterday ended a 2-day meeting at Bommersvik in Sormland. Socialist leaders from the whole world gathered at the meeting, whose themes were peace and the world economy.

It was the first time the Socialist International was unanimous in its condemnation of the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative.

Socialist International Chairman Willy Brandt expressed the organization's deep concern over the continued arms race and its dissatisfaction at the lack of progress at the disarmament negotiations in Geneva.

He outlined the plans for a disarmament conference in Vienna in mid-October to which representatives of the United States, the Soviet Union, China, and the nonaligned states will be invited. This will be the first time that China will be taking part in such an arrangement. A similar conference was held in Helsinki 7 years ago.

The further development of the proposal for a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area will be discussed at a Nordic parliamentary conference in Copenhagen at the end of November.

The Socialist International approved an eight-point program of action for Nicaragua which was put forward by the Norwegian Labor Party's Thorvald Stoltenberg. Parties that are critical of the Sandinists. [sentence incomplete]

Those taking part in the meeting expressed their concern over the attacks on the UN peacekeeping forces in the area and condemned the hijacking in Beirut.

Another resolution condemned the South African intervention in Botswana as a threat to international peace. The resolution also welcomed initiatives in Europe and the United States for economic sanctions against South Africa.

The Socialist International meeting was also concerned over the Polish authorities' punishment of Solidarity leaders in Gdansk and the difficulties of Jews in emigrating from the Soviet Union.

This fall the Socialist International will send a delegation to Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and Israel. A visit to the region planned for June has been canceled.

CSO: 5200/2682

SPACE ARMS

PORTUGAL INTERESTED IN SDI, EUREKA PARTICIPATION

Lisbon EXPRESSO in Portuguese 15 Jun 85 p 3

[Text] Portugal is interested in participating in the advanced studies of the laser and optronics, within the scope of the technological research projects which the United States and France are proposing to their allies, a high official of the Defense Ministry has told EXPRESSO.

Although he said that no decisions had been reached in this regard, the official added that the JNICT (National Scientific and Technological Research Board) should be responsible for coordinating Portugal's possible participation in the various areas of research in which an interest has been expressed, namely by university institutions.

The U.S. administration recently proposed to its NATO allies and to Japan, Israel and Australia that they participate in studies for the Strategic Defense Initiative, for military ends, and the French Government issued the same invitation to the Western European countries with regard to the EUREKA research program, which is civilian in nature.

Portugal was invited to take part in the two projects and expressed an interest in both of them, but has put off a definite response until a later date--as have the rest of the European countries, incidentally.

A U.S. general who is responsible for the SDI in the Pentagon traveled recently to Lisbon to explain the American objectives regarding the research program; meanwhile, a mission is being organized in Lisbon which should go to the United States to assess the possibilities of Portuguese participation in greater detail.

A Defense Ministry source told us yesterday that a French expert is expected in Lisbon next week; he will explain to the Portuguese authorities the goals of the EUREKA project, which should also merit a more detailed analysis at a later time.

The French technicians should meet with some Portuguese scientists who are already engaged in studies of the technical research programs initiated by Washington and Paris, but he will not be received at the Defense Ministry, as he requested, by the two highest officials; Minister Rui Machete and Secretary of State Figueiredo Lopes will be attending the meeting of the Independent European Planning Group (a NATO organ) which is being held in London, for which they will be leaving tomorrow.

The studies called for in the North American and French projects involve laser beams and particle beams, optronics, microelectronics, artificial intelligence and the large computers.

The Defense official contacted by EXPRESSO said that Portugal is focusing its attention on the first two areas, although it might also be interested in microelectronics.

6362

CSO: 5200/2674

INDIAN PRIME MINISTER CRITICIZES 'STAR WARS'

Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA in English 7 Jun 85 p 1

[Text] Cairo, June 6 (PTI & UNI)--The Prime Minister, Mr Rajiv Gandhi, today assailed the United States' Star Wars programme, saying it would bring the world much closer to the "brink" and also stated that Pakistan was very close to making a nuclear bomb.

Addressing a press conference shortly before leaving for Paris after a 26-hour official visit, Mr Gandhi said that during his talks with the Egyptian President, Mr Hosni Mubarak, they had considered how to pursue various initiatives on ending the Gulf war.

India, he said, was trying to persuade both sides to seek peace. They had taken a "softer position" but the situation was still difficult.

On West Asia, Mr Gandhi said it was impossible to come to any solution without the PLO. "We feel that the PLO is the sole representative of the Palestinian people," he said.

Asked how close Pakistan was to having a nuclear bomb and how long it would take India to acquire one, Gandhi said: "We feel Pakistan is very close," reports Reuter.

"We could only say how long it would take us to produce such a device if we decided to produce it, but at the moment we have no intention to decide," he added.

Mr Gandhi doubted if "Star Wars" could be just defensive. "One side produces a defensive weapons and it is countered by the other side. It could be turned into an offensive weapon to bring us close to the brink."

Mr Gandhi said India supported calls for a conference on West Asia peace.

During the two rounds of talks, Mr Gandhi and Mr Mubarak discussed a wide range of international issues and bilateral matters. Mr Gandhi's visit and discussions here are expected to give a fillip to Indo-Egyptian trade.

The delegations of the two countries, too, had discussions separately.

Earlier, addressing members of the Indian community in Egypt, the Prime Minister said that the prospects of finding a political solution to the ethnic problem in Sri Lanka have brightened after his recent meeting with the Sri Lankan leaders.

Mr Gandhi said the Sri Lankan President had indicated during their recent talks that he was prepared to "find a political solution of the problem in the island."

Referring to the Punjab problem, Mr Gandhi welcomed the condemnation of the bomb blast incidents in Delhi and northern India by Akali leaders and their assertion that they were ready to find a political solution to the Punjab problem within the framework of the constitution. He said he would like the Akalis to "tell the government what they wanted."

Mr Gandhi also touched upon the current reservation agitation in Gujarat and assured that the policy of reservation for Harijans and backward classes would not be given up.

CSO: 5250/0010

SPACE ARMS

BRIEFS

USSR: U.S. LASER TEST PLANNED--New York, 3 Jul--Accelerating its "star wars" preparations, Washington intends to conduct new tests of components of space strike arms in the near future. As reported by the magazine AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY, large-scale experiments are planned as part of the project. In the course of them a laser beam from an installation sited on the top of a mountain on Maui Island (Hawaii) will be aimed at "Terrier-Malamute" missiles, fitted with a special mirror to reflect the laser beam, launched to an altitude of 576 kilometers from Hawaii's Barking Sands Test Range. The implementation of Reagan's "star wars" program is leading to the breakup of the existing system of nuclear arms control, the magazine PROGRESSIVE points out. The 1972 Soviet-American Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems will above all be torpedoed. Administration spokesmen are openly talking about such a prospect. [Text] [Moscow TRUD in Russian 4 Jul 85 p 3]

TASS REPORTS RADAR CONTRACTS--Washington, 29 Jun (TASS)--The Pentagon has awarded the companies Raytheon and Westinghouse Electric contracts for the development and construction of new advanced ground radar stations. The installations, capable of distinguishing between nuclear and imitation warheads and of guiding laser and other anti-missile weapons, are considered to be one of the major components of the system of strike space arms. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0936 GMT [no day] Jun 85]

CSO: 5200/1039

MOSCOW: U.S. RENUNCIATION OF SALT II WILL MEAN ARMS ESCALATION

LD221216 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 22 Jun 85

[Excerpts] Let us move on [to] the international section of the program. Now, as usual on Saturdays we shall answer listeners' questions about events in the world. At the microphone is political observer Bronislav Myakota:

(Nikolay Fedorovich Shemko) from Moscow asks what sort of situation could arise in the world if the United States renounces the obligations it has undertaken under the SALT II treaty. The treaty on limiting strategic arms, SALT II was signed by the USSR and the United States 6 years ago. As is known, it was prepared as the result of long and difficult work. The treaty reflected a very important reality of our time--the military parity between the USSR and the United States. It sets limits for strategic armaments. Although it had signed the SALT II treaty, the United States refused to ratify it. However, under pressure from public opinion, Washington was still forced to declare that it intended to refrain from actions which would undermine its provisions. In reality Washington began step by step to violate the treaty. As a result there appeared long-range cruise missiles which are a new class of strategic armaments; and deployment of new U.S. medium-range missiles began in West Europe. The "star wars" plans and other pentagon military programs totally contradict SALT II.

It turns out that while the USSR is honorably and punctiliously fulfilling the conditions of the SALT II treaty, Washington is only seeking ways of gradually creeping out of the framework of this important document which prevents the Pentagon strategists from expanding. For they have set themselves the aim of achieving military superiority over the USSR at any cost and of smashing the existing approximate nuclear parity.

The Soviet leadership has frequently stated most definitely that our country is not striving for military superiority but will not allow such superiority over it either on earth or in space. The USSR will take such measures in response as will be in full accord with the interests of its defense capability. They will be adequate to the threat which could be created against the USSR and its allies. Thus the United States renunciation of the SALT II treaty would inevitably lead to a dangerous and uncontrolled escalation of the nuclear arms race. Our country does not want this. It genuinely desires a cessation of the arms race, the total elimination of nuclear weapons everywhere and the improvement of the international situation.

CSO: 5200/1051

MOSCOW: DEVELOPMENT OF MX, MIDGETMAN VIOLATES SALT II

LD210230 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 20 Jun 85

[Text] The United States House of Representatives voted on Tuesday night [18 June] to limit deployment of the MX missile to a total of 40, 10 less than the United States Senate approved 2 weeks ago, and 60 fewer than President Reagan wanted. Our observer Vladislav Kozyakov discusses the decision and the Administration's reaction to it in his weekly comment.

[Kozyakov] The current debates over the MX missile in Washington show that the United States continues to carry out its nuclear weapons buildup aimed at achieving military superiority. The American mass media regard the vote in the House on Tuesday as another setback in the Administration's struggle to defend the MX missile. But still the building of the new intercontinental weapon is underway, and it's not the only new strategic missile which is being developed in the United States. Another one is the Midgetman missile. What is strongly indicative is that the reduction to some extent of the MX program is accompanied by demands to speed up the Midgetman programme. According to press reports, Congress may give the Administration an extra \$200 million for the single-warhead Midgetman, to accelerate the development of that weapon in case the White House accepts a reduction of the number of MX missiles.

Speaking at his news conference, President Reagan said that he would very seriously consider such an approach to the matter. This means that both the Administration and Congress adhere to the program of nuclear buildup which provides for the development of two new intercontinental ballistic missiles. This is despite the fact that the SALT II treaty allows each side to have only one new strategic missile. Article 4, provision 9 of the treaty says that each party may flight-test and deploy one new type of light intercontinental missile.

Trying to justify their disregard of the SALT II treaty, officials in Washington assured that there is the second new type of strategic missile in the Soviet Union; that is, they say, the SS-25 missile. In fact, however, there is no such thing as (?the) second new type of Soviet strategic missile. In fact the SS-25 is not a new missile; it's an old one--the SS-13 missile--which is being modernized. In other words, the Soviet Union is faithful to the obligations taken in accordance with the provisions of the SALT II treaty. The alleged second new type of Soviet strategic missile does not exist.

It's also noteworthy that the false assertions about the second Soviet missile appeared in Washington after the approval of both new American strategic missiles, the MX and the Midgetman. The United States Administration resorts to various tricks to mislead the American public.

Now let us look at the matter from another angle. The Soviet Union put forth the proposal to immediately declare a mutual moratorium on nuclear and space weapons for the whole period of talks in Geneva. This means that the Soviet Union is prepared to completely curb the development of both nuclear and space armaments, provided the United States does the same. Washington rejects this proposal. It's clear why. The United States Administration gives priority not to seeking mutually acceptable agreements to prevent the arms race in space and stop it on earth, but to further speeding up the arms race in all spheres. The current debate and decisions on building 40 or 50 MX missiles, on developing the Midgetman missile and on carrying out the Star Wars program, are fresh evidence of that.

CSO: 5200/1051

FRG PRESS VIEWS REAGAN DECISION ON SALT II TREATY

Press Review

DW120927 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0505 GMT 12 Jun 85

[From the press review]

[Text] SUEDEDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG of Munich writes the following about President Reagan's decision to continue to abide by the SALT II treaty concluded with the Soviets 6 years ago on strategic arms limitation: Are we facing the beginning of a new dawn? In any event, we cannot expect a second friendly meeting as in 1972, when Nixon and Brezhnev celebrated SALT I as the beginning of eternal peace. The United States and the Soviet Union are the two world powers that on their own can destroy each other. This fear for their existence forces both of them into cautious cooperation, but it simultaneously prevents them from truly putting a stop to their rivalry. The most we can hope for is that they will agree to restrict and perhaps even curtail the development of weapons.

KOELNER STADT-ANZEIGER is of the following opinion: Reagan's decision is an unspoken admission of a wrong assessment. The treaty is useful and not detrimental to the United States, even though only because it slows down the strategic nuclear arms buildup of the USSR more than that of the United States. By abiding by the treaty, the President could sooner or later present it for ratification. Thus, a basis for trust could be created that would provide better prospects than does Geneva for continued negotiations by Moscow and Washington negotiators on "SALT III."

RHEIN-ZEITUNG of Koblenz deals with the Soviet response to Reagan's decision: Moscow's reaction shows that the question of limiting arms under the terms of SALT II is not what is involved at present. Gorbachev's main objection is the missing basis of trust which Brezhnev began to undermine with his SS-20's. Still, the superpowers could negotiate on a "SALT III" treaty, if in the meantime new technology does not make verification of agreements increasingly difficult. Therefore the trade contacts between Washington and Moscow that have become so intense within just a few weeks should be used in the area of military policy.

FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE Editorial

DW121059 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE in German 12 Jun 85 p 12

[Editorial signed "G.N.": "Limited Concession"]

[Text] If the 1979 SALT II treaty had gone into effect, it would have expired on the last day of 1985. This is the measure by which to assess the concession that President Reagan has made to the Soviet Union with his statement that he will continue to observe the treaty as if it had been ratified. His predecessor, Carter, offered the same thing to the Soviet Union on the condition that the USSR reciprocate. The U.S. will soon commission a new submarine and at the same time pull out of service an older Poseidon submarine that will perhaps eventually be scrapped. This implies that there are reservations. In this connection, the President is aware that the Soviet Union is not observing the treaty in a similar manner, but has violated it by introducing more than one new type of long-range missile. The President pointed to the reciprocity proviso. However, the very urgent tone of statements by several European foreign ministers, particularly Genscher, at the NATO meeting to the effect that Reagan should by no means drop SALT II will also be seen by Moscow as an indication of the cohesion of the Western alliance. Moscow will feel encouraged to continue disarmament propaganda instead of pursuing disarmament.

CS0: 5200/2693

FRG GOVERNMENT, SPD ON REAGAN SALT II STANCE

Boenisch 'Extremely Satisfied'

LD111624 Hamburg DPA in German 1517 GMT 11 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn, 11 Jun (DPA) -- The Federal Government welcomes the decision by the U.S. President to continue to respect the SALT II treaty. This decision makes clear the West's interest in intensively continuing the disarmament dialogue with the USSR, and the prime importance the U.S. Government attaches to arms control agreements, government spokesman Peter Boenisch announced in Bonn today. The Federal Government is "extremely satisfied" that the attitude of the European alliance partners was taken into account. The Federal Government appealed to the USSR to observe the existing treaties on arms limitation and to contribute to ensuring that agreements on drastic reductions of the existing nuclear arsenals would soon be possible in Geneva.

Ehmke Welcomes Decision

LD120902 Hamburg DPA in German 0826 GMT 12 Jun 85

[Text] Bonn, 12 Jun (DPAO) -- The SPD has welcomed the decision by U.S. President Ronald Reagan that the United States intends to continue to adhere to the requirements of the SALT II treaty, signed in 1979 but not ratified. In a press statement by the SPD Bundestag caucus, deputy floor leader Horst Ehmke stressed in Bonn today that SALT II, just like the Antiballistic Missile treaty (ABM), is a decisive basis for continuing the disarmament and arms control dialogue between the superpowers.

It is hoped that uncertainties about the adherence to the agreement will be disposed of in a manner satisfactory to both sides by discussions of the U.S.-USSR consultative commission responsible for this, and that possible violations of SALT II will be brought to an end. A contrary development would have "devastating effects on the Geneva disarmament negotiations" and thereby on peace, stability, and security worldwide.

CSO: 5200/2689

FRG EDITORIAL ON SHULTZ' ROLE AT NATO MEETING

DW110939 Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 8 Jun 85 p 3

[Erich Hauser editorial: "Signals for Gorbachev"]

[Text] The spring meeting of the NATO Council of Ministers in the Portuguese seaside town of Estoril ended on an extremely satisfactory note for the foreign ministers of the European allies. It was the first meeting of the supreme political body of the Western alliance since Mikhail Gorbachev, the dynamic new party leader, has been in power in Moscow. While during the past few years the course of East-West relations has been determined in Washington and Moscow alone, the West European NATO partners have now made a very visible attempt to get back into the game.

It is remarkable that Secretary of State George Shultz gave them the leverage to do so. As part of his efforts to strengthen his own position within President Reagan's administration, Shultz asked "the advice" of the West Europeans about whether the United States should continue to respect the Soviet-U.S. SALT II treaty, even though the Soviets are obviously no longer strictly abiding by it. British Secretary of State Geoffrey Howe reduced the common view of the European partners to the formula that it is precisely by respecting valid treaties that the West can challenge the Soviet Union to do the same. In this way one could encourage the leadership in Moscow to place reliance on new and more comprehensive arms control agreements.

A change will possible come about in East-West relations if Moscow gains the impressions that the influence of the "hawks" in Washington can be reduced by means of the skillful policy. However, this means that the Soviets must no longer aim at splitting NATO because this would be the surest way to endanger peace.

If it is true that Gorbachev intends above all to carry out the economic and social modernization of his country, he will have to search for ways to reach an understanding with the West. The Soviet-U.S. negotiations in Geneva with the complex issues of strategic weapons, intermediate-range missiles, and space weapons will be too protracted to offer a speedy approach to detente. Therefore, it is not without reason that the communique of the NATO foreign ministers again refers to the MBFR talks on troop reduction in central Europe, which have been going on for more than a decade now, and to other multilateral East-West negotiations. It is here that real progress toward arms reduction and the removal of distrust could be made, if Moscow and the Eastern bloc states would finally agree to a "verification" of the steps agreed on.

By means of skillful direction, the NATO foreign ministers were able at their meeting to avoid a quarrel over the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI] research program. Shultz said from the very beginning that the participation or nonparticipation in the program by the European partners was not on the agenda. In this way, he made it possible for his French counterpart, Roland Dumas, to formally support the U.S. negotiation position toward the Soviets. For their part, Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher and his European colleagues were able to have the continuing validity of the NATO strategy of a flexible response put down in writing. Nevertheless, NATO circles will have to consider what the consequences will be for the defense of Europe if Reagan's SDI program ever becomes reality.

The elegant way in which Shultz avoided the subject of SDI seems to prove that Washington does not regard the participation of the European partners in the SDI research program as a test of alliance loyalty. In any event, Genscher believes he scored some points in Estoril that he can use in the internal dispute in the Bonn coalition. However, this in no way guarantees that the people in Bonn will realize that the defense policy consequences of the SDI research program -- if this ever really leads to an effective missile defense system -- tend to put the FRG in the same boat as France and Britain, and not with the United States.

The West Europeans do not have any power to influence Washington's course at the negotiations during the Soviet-U.S. dialogue in Geneva. This again became apparent at this NATO meeting. Speedy progress or results are not to be expected. It depends above all on Moscow whether the West European NATO partners' efforts to improve the climate in East-West relations by making progress and reaching results at other negotiations currently in progress can be successful.

CSO: 5200/2689

SWEDISH PAPER VIEWS REAGAN DECISION ON SALT II COMPLIANCE

PM181603 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 12 Jun 85 p 2

[Text] President Ronald Reagan announced Monday that the United States intends to observe the SALT II arms limitation agreement in the future too. However, the United States reserves the right to break the agreement if the Soviet Union continues to do so.

Reagan's declaration of intent, which had been anticipated with some suspense, was more restrained than most people had expected. It seems to confirm that it is the moderate faction in the White House which now has the President's ear on security policy issues. Once again Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger who advocated that SALT II be scrapped has been overruled.

After lengthy negotiation the SALT II agreement was signed in 1979 by U.S. President Jimmy Carter and Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev. However, the agreement was never ratified by the U.S. Senate and is therefore not formally binding. Carter withdrew it after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Despite this both the United States and the Soviet Union have made an informal commitment to respect the agreement's terms. However, in recent years the U.S. Administration has repeatedly accused the Soviet Government of taking steps which run contrary to the SALT agreement.

Whether or not the Soviet Union really has violated the agreement is a question about which there are divided opinions, even among U.S. experts. Certain observers say that reported Soviet steps, in the field of arms development, for example, fall within a kind of gray zone. SALT II sets limits on the quantities of arms of various types which the two superpowers are permitted to deploy. As far as multi-warhead missiles are concerned the maximum number is 1,200.

CSO: 5200/2692

BRIEFS

FRG OFFICIAL ON SALT II--Bonn, 11 Jun (DPA)--The Atlantic alliance had gained "trust and strength" with the U.S. President's decision to continue to respect the SALT II treaty, stated Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher today. In a radio interview, Genscher stressed the decision as an example of consultations among the allies before important decisions. Washington proclaimed with this decision that it wants to "continue the cooperative arms control dialogue with the Soviet Union." This is an important precondition for success in the Geneva disarmament negotiations. At the same time, Genscher appealed to Moscow to adhere strictly to the missile defense treaty (ABM) and also to respect SALT II. [Text] [Hamburg DPA in German 0921 GMT 11 Jun 85]

CSO: 5200/2689

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW STRESSES FRENCH NUCLEAR FORCES' ROLE IN NATO

LDO71423 Moscow International Service in French 1930 GMT 6 Jul 85

[Commentary by Boris Tumanov in the "Notes of a Publicist" program]

[Text] Good evening listeners. I have been occasionally commenting for 3 years now on the need to take the French nuclear potential in the balance of forces on the European Continent into account. I have been using the same arguments during this time to back up this point of view, which seems indisputable to me for the mere fact that France, with or without an independent decision of its own, will become inexorably involved in a nuclear conflict in Europe, which, itself, will of necessity become generalized. I have been saying, and continue to say, that it is practically impossible for France to remain outside a conflict of this type, like some kind of peaceful island in the middle of an ocean of fire.

Now the French Socialist Party's report on the problem of European security, which has just been published in France, says the following, and I quote! It is impossible to establish how France can maintain a normal existence after remaining unscathed in a generalized conflict in the center of Europe.

You see, the French Socialists have merely noted an evident truth. This is the truth, even if it is only half-truth. However, it is of little importance in the end whether it is during or after the conflict that France cannot survive. The main thing is that the French Socialists finally admit that there is no practical meaning to their argument that France's nuclear forces have nothing to do with the NATO potential because their objective is to guarantee, quite independently, France's national security.

What conclusion, then, is to be drawn from this observation for French military strategy? Well, in my view, Paris continues to throw logic overboard by juggling with the words for such evil purposes and they do this with the intention of disassembling the regional ambitions of the new French doctrine, which aspires to extend France's military influence to FRG territory.

It is a strange and disquieting fact that the Socialists' ambitions are shared by the parties of the right. Though they may be using different words, they are all talking about the same thing, and in the same way. While the Socialist Party talks of the deterrent zone extending into the FRG, the liberals in the Union for French Democracy are saying that the narrow idea of the national territory should be replaced by the idea of an enlarged security zone. They, in the Rally for the Republic, say that the defense of France is part and parcel of the defense of Europe, and of France belonging to the NATO alliance.

What do these new trends in the socialists and the right-wing parties' defense policy mean?

It doesn't take a great military brain to realize that they are trying to create a European military bloc within NATO which, while remaining under Washington's domination, will reduce the margin of autonomy that France still has in the sphere of defense to almost zero. In the meantime, the French bourgeois press is conditioning public opinion by claiming that the FRG would immediately fly to France's aid if the latter were seriously threatened, and that the French should only be prepared to do the same for their neighbors across the Rhine.

A very touching display of anticipated comradeship-in-arms, I must say. However, I wish someone would tell me, without resorting to the absurd and without calling up support from Yves Montand and his cock-eyed visions of Russian tanks in Paris, just how and just who might seriously threaten France? Wouldn't it just be more honest to acknowledge another evident fact and accept that France's nuclear forces should be taken into account in NATO's nuclear potential? After all, the USSR cannot be expected to be blind forever to the French nuclear missiles, whose destination is now clear to everyone, including the French Socialists themselves.

CSO: 5200/1049

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

FRG JUDGE: PERSHING VIOLATE CONSTITUTION

LD191305 Hamburg DPA in German. 1144 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Excerpts] Frankfurt, 19 Jun (DPA) — The deployment of the Pershing II nuclear weapon system in the Federal Republic is contrary to the Constitution, in the view of a Frankfurt district court. With this justification, among others, the court acquitted the six defendants of the charge of coercion in the trial concerning the blockade of the U.S. supply depot of Frankfurt-Hausen on Wednesday. The sit-down blockade on 9 December 1983 against the "counter-arming" was not contrary to the law, but was a legitimate exercising of the basic rights of freedom of opinion and assembly, explained Judge Christoph Jahr in the verdict.

In a 3-hour explanation of the verdict, the judge derived from the statements [by peace research figures who had given evidence during the trial] the legal assessment that "the Federal Government has broken valid constitutional law in two respects with its agreement to deploy the missiles." In the first place, counter-arming infringes the rule on reunification in the Preamble to the Basic Law. On the basis of this rule, the Federal Government is obliged to refrain from anything that endangers the restoration of German unity. The missile deployment to a special degree threatens the population of the GDR as one part of the German people.

Also, in the view of the judge, the deployment represents an infringement of the ban on an aggressive war in Article 26 of the Basic Law. Precise aim makes the Pershing missiles "first-use weapons." Their deployment represents an "impermissible threat of force from the point of view of international law." The United States has increased the danger of war with willful intent, which disturbs peace, and has made preparations for a possible aggressive war with the new weapons system. With their agreement to the deployment, the Federal Government is taking part in a "malicious playing with fire."

CSO: 3200/2686

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

DUTCH DEFENSE MINISTER ON MISSILE DEPLOYMENT TERMS

PM241818 Rotterdam NRC HANDELSBLAD in Dutch 19 Jun 85 p 1

[Unnamed "own correspondent" report: "De Ruiter: Missile Agreement Unbreakable"]

[Text] The Hague, 19 Jun -- If the Netherlands Government decides on 1 November 1985 in favor of the deployment of cruise missiles (in 1988), an agreement with the United States will leave no room for rapid withdrawal or renegotiation as wanted by the Netherlands Labor Party [PvdA] Defense Minister De Ruiter said today in an interview with the daily TROUW.

"We do not intend to include in an agreement any provision for prompt withdrawal or the possibility of renegotiation," the minister said, adding that he would not be available for service after the May 1986 elections in a Cabinet with the PvdA if such a Cabinet would not keep to such an agreement. Labor Party leader Den Uyl and former Minister Stemerding have declared repeatedly that the PvdA, which is totally opposed to deployment, would, if returned to government, suspend a deployment agreement or would want to renegotiate it.

De Ruiter rejected this wish from the largest opposition party. He is against "making constitutional and international legal issues subject to the changing political situation." He also said: "The observance of agreements is the foundation of every coalition." He added, "Politically speaking, we cannot leave ourselves exposed for 4 years; political continuity is an important feature of a society like ours." Mr Stemerding conceded to Vara Radio this morning that agreements are not made simply to be terminated shortly afterward and that the PvdA would be dependent for new negotiations on the U.S. preparedness for such negotiations.

In the interview Christian Democratic Appeal Minister De Ruiter said that on 1 November the Netherlands Government really does not need to reach any decision about deployment. "What is involved are the conclusions we reach on the foundation of the 1 June decision," he said.

CSO: 5200/2686

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT IN EUROPE

USSR NOTIFIES CSCE STATES OF 'CAUCASUS-85' EXERCISES

LD262028 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 26 Jun 85

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS -- As earlier reported, an exercise of the forces of the Transcaucasian Military District codenamed "Caucasus-85" will be held from July 15 to 21, 1985, in the area of Rustavi, Akstafa, Tsiteli-Tskaro and Sagaredzho. The total number of troops involved in the exercise will be around 25,000.

In keeping with the relevant provisions of the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, the Soviet side on June 24 sent corresponding notifications to the states participating in the Helsinki conference.

Invitations to send observers to the exercise were forwarded to the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the German Democratic Republic, the Polish People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Hellenic Republic, the Italian Republic, Spain, the Republic of Cyprus, the Republic of Malta, the Portuguese Republic and the Turkish republic.

CSO: 5200/1038

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

TASS: GDR DELEGATE CRITICIZES U.S. STANCE AT U.S.-USSR TALKS

LD251629 Moscow TASS in English 1548 GMT 25 Jun 85

[Text] Geneva June 25 TASS--To ensure progress in the field of limiting the arms race and of disarmament it is necessary that the USA should alter its stand, a plenary session of the Conference on Disarmament was told today by Harald Rose, head of the GDR delegation. This concern, above all, the current Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons. The Soviet Union, the speaker pointed out, had put forward proposals on all aspects of the talks and made practical steps to facilitate their holding. Among them is the proposal to introduce for the whole period of the talks a moratorium on strike space weapons and nuclear strategic weapons, the USSR's unilateral commitment not to be the first to put anti-satellite weapons into outer space, and to suspend the deployment of medium-range missiles. At last, this is the strict observance of the provisions of the SALT-II treaty by the Soviet Union.

A constructive answer to these acts of good will would be welcomed everywhere, said Harald Rose. Yet, the USA is trying to disregard the January agreement on the aims and subject of the talks and the agreed principle of inter-connection between the issues under discussion.

The American plans for a militarisation of outer space, he went on to say, are aimed at torpedoing the process of disarmament and making the attainment of new agreements impossible, while turning the old agreements into scraps of paper. It would have extremely dangerous consequences for the whole world. They would place it on the verge of a nuclear war.

Speaking on other issues on the agenda of the conference, the GDR representative expressed indignation at the decision of the U.S. Congress to set aside appropriations on the production of chemical binary weapons. This shows that Washington is out, in real fact, to hamper the talks on that issue and divert attention from its plans to create an absolutely new generation of chemical weapons.

CSO: 5200/1056

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

ISRAELYAN URGES BAN ON NEW MASS-DESTRUCTION ARMS DEVELOPMENT

LD041520 Moscow TASS in English 1505 GMT 4 Jul 85

[Text] Geneva July 4 TASS -- If an international agreement is reached to ban the development and production of new types and systems of mass destruction weapons, this would make it possible to prevent a dangerous turn of events, said Viktor Israelyan, head of the Soviet delegation, addressing the Geneva Disarmament Conference today.

In the USA, he said, enormous funds are channelled to ensure a fresh qualitative leap in military technology in the field of defensive and offensive weapons, nuclear and conventional, space and beam, kinetic and others. Such a leap threatens unpredictable dangers that will by far exceed the dangers of the military nuclear technology.

In this connection the Soviet delegation tables for examination a new proposal that the states participating in the disarmament conference should commit themselves to start immediately, after some or other type of mass destruction weapons emerges, talks on its ban with a simultaneous introduction of a moratorium on its practical development. It is also proposed to form a group of experts to keep these questions under permanent control.

V. Israelyan then stressed the significance of the working paper recently introduced by the group of the socialist countries on the prohibition of the radiological weapons and attack against nuclear facilities. He pointed out that the question of banning this kind of weapon is quite ripe for resolution. As far as the list of the nuclear facilities to be defended from attack is concerned, it should include the objectives covered by the guarantees of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The head of the Soviet delegation urged all the other delegations to start immediately effective talks on the question of the prohibition of the new types and systems of mass destruction weapons and prohibition of the radiological weapons.

CSO: 5200/1038

CONFERENCE ON DISARMAMENT

BRIEFS

SOCIALIST INTERNATIONAL ON DISARMAMENT--Stockholm (APA, DPA)--The Socialist International (SI) will convene a disarmament conference in Vienna in mid-October, and will invite guests from the United States and the USSR, as well as UN representatives. This transpired on Tuesday [18 June] on the periphery of a SI Bureau meeting in Bommersvik near Stockholm which is being held under the chairmanship of former FRG Chancellor Willy Brandt. Participating in this meeting are, from Austria, SPOe Honorary Chairman Bruno Kreisky in his capacity as SI deputy chairman; SPOe Central Secretary Fritz Marsch, chairman of the Austrian Nationalrat's Foreign Policy Committee; and Walter Hacker, former international secretary of the SPOe. [Excerpts] [Vienna WIENER ZEITUNG in German 19 Jun 85 p 1]

CSO: 5200/2687

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

PRAVDA CITES BULGARIAN DELEGATE ON FORCES FREEZE

PM021540 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Jun 85 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Way To Achieve Favorable Conditions"]

[Text] Vienna, 28 Jun — E. Savov, head of the Bulgarian delegation, has addressed a routine plenary session of the talks on the mutual reduction of armed forces and armaments in Central Europe.

As reported at a press briefing, he drew attention to the great importance of the section of the Warsaw Pact states' proposal of 14 February this year which envisages not increasing the level of the sides' armed forces and armaments after the initial reductions have been carried out.

The security interests both of the direct participants in the talks and of those participants with special status could only benefit, the Bulgarian representative noted, if the initial reductions of Soviet and U.S. forces are not followed by a further buildup of forces and armaments in central Europe. That negative trend would be halted and more favorable conditions created for further talks.

The Bulgarian representative urged the Western participants in the talks to respond constructively to the socialist countries' proposals.

CSO: 5200/1040

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: U.S., UK HOLD 'SECRET TALKS' ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS

LD032010 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 3 Jul 85

[Text] London July 3 TASS — TASS correspondent Aleksandr Yevstigneyev reports:

Secret talks were held here recently between a U.S. delegation and representatives of the British Defence Ministry and the Foreign Office. According to the NEW STATESMAN weekly, matters aimed at coordinating Washington's and London's efforts in chemical war conditions were discussed at the talks.

The weekly points out that the White House would like to win West European countries' support for its programme for a build-up of the arsenals of chemical weapons, and, in particular, the stocks of binary shells which, in line with U.S. plans, are to be sited in Europe.

Such aims, judging by everything, find understanding with the Tory Cabinet. NEW STATESMAN reports that a supersecret special ministerial committee has been set up in London and is considering the question of the creation by Britain of its own stocks of chemical weapons of neuro-paralytic effect. The Conservative government, acting in the role of Washington's main partner for preparation for chemical warfare, holds exercises of British troops on a regular basis. Chemical attacks are practiced during the exercises. The secret Appleton laboratory is functioning at Porton Down. The laboratory engages in the development and testing of various types of chemical weapons. Besides, as the local press reports, an intensive development of new techniques in the tactics of the conduct of chemical war is under way at the Staff College of Britain's land forces at Camberley.

CSO: 5200/1052

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

PRAVDA ON EUROPEAN RESISTANCE TO U.S. BINARY ARMS PLANS

PM022036 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 85 First Edition p 2

[Nikolay Kurdyumov's "Commentator's Column"; "Evil Designs"]

[Text] Under pressure from the administration, the U.S. Congress has approved a program for building up chemical weapon arsenals. Toeing the Pentagon's line, the lawmakers voted in favor of appropriations in the coming fiscal year to fund the development of one of the most barbaric types of chemical weapons -- binary nerve gas munitions -- and preparations for their production.

In its attempts to justify its evil designs the Washington administration has resorted to the traditional maneuver of hypocrisy and deception. Suffice it to say that the special presidential commission which has been set up to divert attention and which consists of inveterate militarists has gone as far as to cynically claim in its report that the further buildup of the U.S. chemical potential will allegedly be conducive to the cause of banning chemical weapons.

However, in fact they themselves exposed the falsity of this "reasoning" by betraying Washington's true aggressive intentions: The commission had to admit that the most likely area where the binary munitions might be used is the European Continent, which is regarded across the ocean as the main "theater of military operations." This means that, in addition to deploying nuclear first strike missiles in West European countries, the United States is preparing to foist another "gift" on its NATO allies -- cramming the territories of the West European countries with new, even more sophisticated chemical munitions [boyezaryad].

In this context it is not difficult to understand why the prospect of the continent's densely populated areas being transformed into a potential arena of horrific chemical warfare has immediately given rise to indignation and widespread protests in West European countries. The Netherlands Government declared through its foreign minister that it has no intention of allowing the United States to site chemical weapons on Dutch territory.

In the FRG the "Greens" subjected the U.S. plans to sharp criticism in the Bundestag. L. Budtz, chairman of the Danish Social Democratic Party's commission for security and foreign policy questions, stated Denmark's firm opposition to chemical weapons. He advocated a ban on chemical weapons and expressed support for the idea of establishing a chemical-weapon-free zone in Europe. In turn, the British press has noted in recent days that the U.S. decision was adopted just when a number of governments are investigating the possibility of banning chemical weapons.

Demands that the siting of new U.S. chemical weapons on European territory be resolutely rejected continue to intensify. They confirm once again that the stepping up of states' efforts aimed at banning and eliminating chemical and other mass destruction weapons as soon as possible, which is what the Soviet Union has been advocating all along, accords with the peoples' true interests.

CSO: 5200/1052

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

MOSCOW TV SEES 'HYPOCRISY' IN HOUSE CHEMICAL ARMS FUNDING VOTE

OW210913 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 20 Jun 85

[From the Novosti newscast; commentary by Aleksandr Serikov]

[Text] The U.S. House of Representatives has approved the allocation of \$124.5 million for perfecting chemical weapons.

[Serikov] Hello, comrades. U.S. legislators approving new expenditures to produce weapons of mass destruction made a hypocritical stipulation. It is necessary to produce chemical weapons until an international agreement prohibiting their use is worked out.

Actually, such an agreement does exist. The Geneva Protocol on the Prohibition of the Use of Chemical and Bacteriological Weapons was signed as far back as 18 June 1925. [video shows World War I documentary footage] Recalling the horrible consequences of the use of toxins by Germany during World War I, more than 100 countries, including the Soviet Union, endorsed this agreement. However, no U.S. signature appears on this document. [video shows Vietnam war documentary footage]

These scenes were shot in Vietnam where the Pentagon used the highly toxic substance Agent Orange. U.S. aircraft sprayed more than 72 million liters of toxins over Vietnam. Many hectares of forest, but more importantly, hundreds of thousands of people perished. Nearly 2 million people were left crippled. And people continue to perish from the use of U.S. chemical weapons, which has been proven in battles against Somozists in Nicaragua and against dushmans in Afghanistan.

A real acceleration of preparations for chemical warfare began with the coming to power of the Reagan Administration. Under the pretext of a mythical foreign threat, the President's Special Commission on Chemical Weapons recommended replacing the existing chemical arsenal with new binary weapons, more toxic and powerful. [video shows U.S. bases, the Pentagon, chemical weapons]

However, it is known that there are more than 150,000 metric tons of chemical weapons--missiles, shells, bombs, and grenades--at U.S. military bases around the world capable of destroying all life on earth many times over. Moreover, it seems that this is not enough for the U.S. rulers, and they are allocating new funds for the arms race. Truly, all means, including chemical destruction, are fine in order to satisfy Washington's aggressive ambitions.

CSO: 5200/1053

CHEMICAL BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

FRG'S BAHR ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS ACCORD WITH SED

DW201109 Mainz ZDF Television Network in German 1815 GMT 19 Jun 85

[Interview with SPD Presidium member Egon Bahr by Giselher Suhr in Bonn--live]

[Text:] [Suhr] Good evening, Mr Bahr.

[Bahr] Good evening, Mr Suhr.

[Suhr] For over a year you have conducted negotiations with the GDR's state party whose leadership claim has even been laid down in the Constitution. This practically means that the opposition here is negotiating with the GDR Government on foreign policy. Is this possible?

[Bahr] As you have seen, it is. The SED raised this question in another form during the negotiations. The SED justly pointing out that it is the state-supporting party, as it were, wondered whether it is at all worth its while to talk with an FRG opposition party. But I must say that the CDU could have had such negotiations too. Colleague Todenhoefer more than a year ago stated that a zone free from chemical weapons in Europe would be a good thing to promote the worldwide negotiations. And secondly, at the very moment when the Federal Government picks up the matter and the GDR Government does so as well, it will go from the party level to the state level. This is what I hope very much.

[Suhr] Of course this may involve a long stretch of road. What you introduced in Bonn today bears the title "Framework for an Agreement for the Establishment of a Zone Free From Chemical Weapons in Europe." Yet, both German states themselves do not have chemical weapons. So what is supposed to happen with the accord?

[Bahr] This was one of the most important and most difficult points which we had to discuss. It is a fact that both German states -- and to answer your allegedly unanswered question -- and also Czechoslovakia, at least, must accost those states which have these weapons -- and this has been envisaged. They must ask these states to withdraw chemical weapons from the territories of at least the FRG, the GDR, and Czechoslovakia, which means that they have to approach the Soviet Union and the United States.

In my mind there is no doubt that the Soviet Union, according to its statements, will proceed along these lines if and when it is so approached, and after Mr Dregger's return from the United States I do not doubt that the United States will proceed the same way. After all, Mr Weinberger told him that the United States is prepared to withdraw the chemical weapons from our country, even though people have kept saying that the Soviet Union possesses an immense superiority and this would thus involve a unilateral pullout. Our model offers the pullout on both sides. I believe that this is a great advantage.

[Suhr] What is the use of the long negotiations if the United States is prepared, as reaffirmed to Dregger, to discontinue stockpiling its chemical weapons in our country and store them at home instead and if, as you believe, the Soviet Union likewise would be prepared to withdraw the weapons unilaterally, as it were, to match the U.S. move? Considering this, is there any use for the SPD-SED accord?

[Bahr] If both sides would make a unilateral pullout, I would be very happy indeed. What would remain, however, would be verifying to ensure that such weapons will not be returned into a chemical weapons-free zone. For this reason the parties involved should revert to our model; it is the best there is at the moment in the world.

[Suhr] To the extent it has become known so far, the reaction of the Bonn government is divided. On the one hand, they propose to carefully examine the proposals you advanced. On the other hand, government spokesman Sudhoff says that the results are lagging behind the Geneva negotiations which envisage worldwide chemical disarmament.

[Bahr] To begin with I think it is quite appropriate because the Federal Government time and again was informed about the state of negotiations, at no time did the Federal Government advise us against holding or continuing these talks. Moreover, as far as the point that a worldwide agreement would be preferable, this is exactly what we believe too. If there were a worldwide ban of chemical weapons, we would accept it immediately and throw away our accord. Although the situation is less than ideal, we should accomplish some good.

[Suhr] Nevertheless, the question remains: The superpowers are negotiating in Geneva; of what significance can intra-German proposals be that are advanced from the periphery?

[Bahr] I will tell you of one point, as an example. Unlike what Mr Sudhoff has said--I am not familiar with his statement and rely entirely on what you just said--we have advanced in one point beyond what has so far been achieved in Geneva; this point being that in the event of undisputed suspicion an inspection must be made on the spot by an international commission. This is one of the highly important points which has so far foiled everything in Geneva [an dem in Genf bisher alles vorbeigeht]. Perhaps the two Germany's can do some good after all.

[Suhr] One last question: Can a German politician from the West be satisfied if a German politician from the East is equally satisfied? Lindner, CDU/CSU Bundestag caucus spokesman on policy on Germany, has already said in no uncertain terms that the SPD once again lends itself to being misused by Moscow, as he put it.

[Bahr] To begin with, the accord was our initiative. Moreover, it is the characteristic feature of all disarmament negotiations and all disarmament results that both sides must be satisfied, as otherwise it will not work. The United States and the USSR must be satisfied with SALT II, otherwise neither of them would have agreed to it. If you find fault with that, you simultaneously say that there must not be any agreement between East and West. Both sides must be satisfied, and in this particular case we have achieved it.

[Suhr] Thank you very much, Egon Bahr in Bonn.

CSO: 5200/2688

FRG ENVOY PRAISES SPD-SED CHEMICAL-FREE ZONE ACCORD

AU211945 Rome ANSA in English 1935 GMT 21 Jun 85

[Text] (ANSA) -- Rome, June 21 -- The West German ambassador to Rome today praised the joint proposal of the West German Social Democratic Party and East German Unified Socialist Party to create a chemical arms-free zone in Europe.

Hans Voss said in a press conference today that the initiative "would be a very important step for detente and the creation of trust between East and West."

The chemical arms-free zone project is the result of negotiations between the two parties that began in March 1984. According to Voss, the project does not clash with disarmament negotiations under way in Geneva but could be "a step towards a broader solution" which is not stalemated over control. The project would concern in the first stage seven nations (West Germany, Benelux, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Poland) that come under the MBFR talks in Vienna for reduction of conventional weapons. The project contains proposals on control criteria which could "stimulate" negotiations under way. The project has been submitted by the two political parties to their respective governments. The ambassador said West Germany has "reacted very prudently." If the government agrees to the proposal, it will be up to Bonn to persuade the other European governments involved.

Voss said only a few years ago a proposal of this kind was unthinkable. He said that thanks to the talks that led to the proposal the two political parties will now try to draft a similar project on a nuclear-free zone.

CSO: 5200/2688

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW: U.S. DEPLOYMENTS IN PUERTO RICO VIOLATE TLATELOLCO

LD282316 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1645 GMT 28 Jun 85

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Vyacheslav Lavrentyev; with Nikolay Agayants commentary]

[Excerpts] The PUERTO RICO LIBRE journal, published in New York by the Committee in Solidarity With Puerto Rico, has published an article in which the present Washington administration's plans to deploy nuclear weapons on the island in the event of extraordinary circumstances are subjected to sharp criticism. This is a direct violation of the Tlatelolco Treaty which also bears the signature of a U.S. representative.

I ask my colleague, foreign policy commentator of All-Union Radio, Nikolay Agayants, to speak on this in greater detail:

Ronald Reagan's government, conducting its adventuristic course for the escalation of U.S. military interference in Central America and the Caribbean Basin, is striving to transform Puerto Rico into a foremost base for its Armed Forces in that region, into an unsinkable aircraft-carrier crammed with nuclear charges. This island, with a territory of approximately 9,000 square km and a population of more than 3.5 million people, declared by Washington in 1952 to be a state freely associated with the United States, and in essence thereby, remaining a colony of the United States, has become, as was noted in one of the Pentagon's secret documents, the cornerstone of America's military efforts in the Caribbean Basin. It is from there that during the U.S. bandit invasion of Grenada, 300 cutthroat, special purpose troops arrived.

Thus, the Tlatelolco Treaty concluded in 1977 [as heard] banning nuclear weapons in Latin America, is being blatantly and cynically flouted by Washington every day and every hour. At the moment, the matter concerns the fact that the installations created by the Pentagon for storing lethal bombs of great capacity are already ready to receive the first batch of this weaponry for storage.

There are currently approximately 20,000 American soldiers and officers on the U.S. bases. The island's very geographical position allows the Pentagon's brass hats to operationally transfer from it and across it contingents of the Rapid Deployment Force.

Apart from that, the White House considers Puerto Rico to be an important communications center in the unified system of command and control. In particular, on the west coast, in (Oquada) a relay station has been created to maintain links with atomic submarines; and in the northwest, in Isabela, with surface ships equipped with nuclear missiles. Relay transmitters in Salinas and Juan Diaz, on the island's south coast, presently link up to a communications system which should go into action for the broadcasting of orders of the President and those of the U.S. high command on carrying out nuclear strikes if nuclear war begins. It is clear that such Pentagon activity in Puerto Rico presents a colossal threat to both the local population and to all the peoples of Central America and Caribbean Basin.

PRAVDA COMMENTS ON SOUTH PACIFIC NFZ PROPOSALS

PM011247 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 85 first edition p 5

[Dmitriy Kosyrev "Commentator's Column": "Vital Idea"]

[Text] A working party of the South Pacific Forum organization spent 10 months preparing a draft treaty on proclaiming that extensive region a nuclear-free zone. After the meeting of representatives of the forum which was held in Suva, capital of Fiji, the other day, it was announced that work on the project has been completed. The decision to set up a group to prepare this document was adopted last August by a session of the organization, which includes Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, and the small independent states of the South Pacific--Vanuatu, Fiji, and others, making 13 countries in all.

The struggle for deliverance from the nuclear danger in all its forms has in recent years increasingly markedly been emerging as the Pacific people's priority task. Washington, speaking of "shifting the burden of policy to the Pacific," is deploying more and more new nuclear charges there and building new military facilities. The ocean is plied by American ships carrying nuclear weapons, and their arsenals are now being supplemented by Tomahawk cruise missiles. France is still carrying out nuclear tests on Mururoa Atoll, and formerly Washington and London carried out similar tests. Japan recently tried to sink radioactive waste from its nuclear power stations in the ocean. So the small states which received their independence recently are coming out clearly and unequivocally in favor of delivering the Pacific Ocean from these troubles and have joined their voice to the mighty antinuclear and antiwar actions in Australia and New Zealand. It must also be remembered that the struggle to create a nuclear-free zone is on the program of those countries' ruling parties. All this is reflected in the draft treaty: It includes such points as a ban on the production and possession of nuclear weapons for the forum countries and bans on nuclear weapons tests and the burying of radioactive waste.

It is clear that the Pentagon strategists are unenthusiastic about this turn of events. They also greeted without joy the decision to prepare the treaty. But it is politically inconvenient for Washington to make a frontal attack on the very idea of a nuclear-free zone. So the struggle is over the concrete content with which the document will be filled. Thus at the last forum session Australia, a U.S. ally in the ANZUS bloc, came out against each country's making a pledge not to allow ships carrying nuclear weapons into its ports. This was reflected in the draft treaty.

The draft will be submitted for discussion at the forum's next session, which is to be held in August of this year. There will undoubtedly be a struggle over it. But whatever the document's fate, it is already clear that the peoples of the South Pacific do not intend to and will not reconcile themselves to the growth of the nuclear threats in their region.

CSO: 5200/1055

TASS LISTS EXISTING, PROPOSED NFZ'S

LDO41814 Moscow TASS in English 1753 GMT 4 Jul 85

["Nuclear-Free Zones are Reality"--TASS Headline]

[Text] Moscow July 4 TASS--TASS political news analyst Robert Serebrennikov writes:

Hiroshima has been proclaimed a city of peace free from nuclear weapons. Such is the will expressed by 270 thousand people of that Japanese city that was the first victim of the U.S. Atomic bombing 40 years ago. On the basis of the will of the people Hiroshima's municipal council adopted a declaration which proclaims complete elimination of nuclear weapons the urgent task of humanity.

"Our city has been proclaimed a zone free from nuclear weapons, a zone of peace," Stelai with such signs were placed now in more than 500 cities and large populated localities in 42 out of 47 prefectures. They account for 40 per cent of Japan's population. Also, more than 170 cities and areas of Great Britain, including greater London, proclaimed their territories nuclear-free zones. Mass rallies are held in the FRG under the slogan "Turn Street After Street and City After City into Nuclear-Free Zones." More than 60 cities, communities and administrative districts in the FRG prohibited the deployment, storage and transportation of mass destruction weapons.

The idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in the north of Europe is gaining ground. It is vigorously supported by major political parties, trade unions, public organisations of Scandinavian countries. The parliaments of Denmark and Iceland, the Swedish Government, the Social Democratic Party of Norway declared in support of that proposal advanced by Finland's president Urho Kekkonen more than 20 years ago.

13 countries of Oceania, including Australia and New Zealand, came out in favor of drawing up a treaty proclaiming the southern Pacific a nuclear-free zone. The Pacific Ocean must become a zone of peace. Such is the insistent demand of littoral states of that vast region. The movement for creating nuclear-free zones is gaining momentum in the Balkans, in Italy, Portugal, the Netherlands, Canada and Puerto Rico.

In the USA, the people of Oakland twice declared by the overwhelming majority for turning California into a nuclear-free zone. The public of New York is stepping up the struggle for a non-nuclear harbour Staten Island.

The policy of the Soviet Union, which advanced a concrete programme of measures for removing nuclear danger through radical limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons up to their complete elimination, is fully in keeping with the noble aspirations of the movement for creating nuclear-free zones and zones of peace. But the United States and its closest allies in NATO continue disrupting in every way the implementation of the noble idea, that of riding the globe of nuclear weapons step by step.

CSO: 5200/1055

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

SWEDISH RIKSDAG DEPUTY VISITS USSR, DISCUSSES SECURITY POLICY

PM301425 Stockholm SVENSKA DAGBLADET in Swedish 28 May 85 p 6

[Lars Christiansson report: "Convinced of the Soviet Union's Guilt"]

[Text] "What was said in Moscow by the Soviets did nothing to change my view of the submarine violations. I am personally convinced that they are still being carried out predominantly by the Soviet Union and I made this clear during my conversations in Moscow," said Carl Bildt, security policy expert of the Moderate Coalition Party after his return from a visit to the Soviet Union.

"We had very detailed discussions of the submarine crises. They dealt with submarine 137, Harsfjarden, the submarine commission, and with what happened before and since."

Bildt believes that the talks he had were valuable and constructive. He described IMEMO, the Institute for World Economy and International Relations, as "by far the most important of the various institutes in the Soviet Union in the field of foreign policy." Bildt traveled to Moscow at the invitation of IMEMO.

In addition to his discussions with various representatives of IMEMO -- both military and civilian -- Bildt also had high-level talks with representatives of the Central Committee Secretariat. Bildt said that when he raised the submarine violations he met sometimes with dismissals, sometimes with counterattacks from his hosts.

"On one occasion the view was put forward that the submarine commission's report was a political conspiracy aimed at preventing Olof Palme from carrying out his plans to reduce the size of the Swedish defense forces.

I rejected this, in all its parts, with great firmness. "I made it clear: the fact that just because Armed Forces Commander in Chief Lennart Ljung has been unable to determine the nationality of the submarines carrying out the violations since the submarine commission's report does not mean that the submarines do not have a nationality," Bildt said, pointing out that no Soviet representative claimed that Sweden has been violated by NATO submarines. Their line was that there have not been any submarine violations with the exception of submarine 137 which was an accident.

Bildt said that he often returned to the defense committee's security policy report about which there is political agreement among Sweden's political parties.

"On one occasion I read aloud from the report and gave a careful explanation of the meaning of certain key points and pointed to the significance of the political agreement surrounding Swedish security policy."

During the talks, no one questioned Sweden's policy of neutrality, in the sense that Sweden would abandon it, even though there were differing emphasis in the interpretation of neutrality policy. But the Soviets realize that the policy of neutrality is undoubtedly in Sweden's interest, Bildt said.

"But this does not rule out attempts to influence the formulation and content of this policy," Bildt said.

One of the people with whom Bildt talked was institute departmental chief Lev Voronkov who has made a name for himself as a critic of the Swedish policy of neutrality. For example, Voronkov has alleged that Sweden is investing too much in its Armed Forces and that it should instead work to form part of a Nordic nuclear-free zone. The criticism that Sweden's defenses are too strong cropped up in several of Bildt's conversations. Sweden should be more active in peace and disarmament initiatives and work for the Nordic nuclear-free zone.

Bildt voiced some skepticism about the zone and said that he did not see any possibility of the zone being realized within the foreseeable future. At the same time, he stressed that the continued discussion of the zone has an intrinsic value, since it underlines the nuclear-free status of the Nordic area in peacetime.

Voronkov's views on Swedish policy have already been dismissed by Foreign Ministry Under Secretary Pierre Schori on the grounds that they do not have any foundation in official Soviet policy.

However, Bildt takes the view that Voronkov's views cannot be dismissed as marginal ideas. "They kept returning with considerable force during my talks. The aim could well be an attempt to influence us to change our political line," the Moderate [Coalition Party] Riksdag deputy commented.

Problems concerning the normalization of relations between Sweden and the Soviet Union were not discussed. "It was made clear by both sides that we are striving for good relations. At the same time I stressed that this presupposes respect for our borders," Bildt said.

Alongside Nordic security policy the main topics of the discussions were U.S.-USSR relations and disarmament questions. Bildt said that a possible explanation of why these topics played such a major role is that he was in Washington recently and that the Russians therefore took a great interest in his views and analyses of these questions.

Bildt said that there was considerable criticism of Norway's policies and NATO membership, on the subject of contingency stockpiling, for example. But the main issue was President Reagan's proposed space defenses, the so-called "star wars." There is great Soviet concern over the consequences of an arms race in space. As Bildt understood it, this concern is chiefly due to the Soviet Union's internal social and economic problems. "A concern which I can share to a large extent," Bildt said.

"I suppose I view this as an indication that they are trying to see how far it is possible to influence Swedish policy." Bildt stressed to SVENSKA DAGBLADET how important it is to speak plainly to the Russians. During his visit Bildt had the impression that in the immediate future the new Soviet leadership will chiefly concentrate on internal problems.

"The superpower relationship with the United States is a very important issue for the Soviet leadership. Even though relations with Sweden are not an entirely unimportant question because of the Nordic area's increased strategic significance, it is relations with the United States that dominate."

Bildt ended by explaining that he stressed to the Soviets that Sweden is building its submarine hunt capacity, and it "will reach a level that will mean intruding submarines will expose themselves to extremely high risks. We are hoping that the submarine violations will cease, regardless of who is behind them."

CSO: 5200/2694

ICELAND'S ALTHING BACKS NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

PM161835 Oslo AFTENPOSTEN in Norwegian 10 Jun 85 p 8

[Olav Trygve Storvik "Commentary" article: "Nuclear-Free Zone Icelandic-Style"]

[Text] Recently, all the political parties in the Icelandic Althing gave their backing to a text explaining Iceland's goals on disarmament questions and nuclear-free zones. The resolution has not attracted much public attention in the rest of the Nordic area, but there could be good reason to look a little more closely at the text in the light of the island's increasing strategic importance as a result of the expansion of the Soviet Union's northern fleet.

It is clear from the book "Nuclear-Free Status for Northern Europe" by L. Voronkov published by the Nauka Publishing House in Moscow last year that in a long-term strategic plan Moscow's objective is to drive Iceland out of NATO. Detailed attention is paid to Iceland in the book, and even though it must be assumed that an Icelandic withdrawal from NATO must be seen in a very long-term political perspective, a partial goal toward such a development could be to influence the country into making declarations of divergent views within the alliance's strategy so that the country would in the end approach a kind of neutral basis.

It is in such a context that we must assess the Soviet efforts to influence the Icelandic security policy debate. The overmanned Soviet Embassy in Reykjavik exhibits great activity and the NOVOSTI press agency is used to put out reports of supposed nuclear arms on Icelandic territory at suitable points in time. Even though the truth content of such reports is more than dubious it is nevertheless enough to set rumors in motion. The political object is of course to keep the debate on nuclear arms and, in the broader context, the debate on NATO alive in Icelandic public opinion. Bearing in mind that the country's population is only 230,000 it is presumably also easier to influence public opinion.

After a lengthy period of debate which even by Icelandic standards must have had a somewhat divisive effect, a draft statement on nuclear-free zones in the Nordic area was drawn up and here Foreign Minister Geir Hallgrímsson was one of the active parties. According to this statement, which won the backing of all the parties in the Althing, every initiative which could break the "vicious circle" of the arms race is welcomed. According to the Althing the Icelandic Government should support moves which could promote an end to nuclear arms testing and bring the production and deployment of such arms under control. The government should also support international agreements for systematic annual reductions in the nuclear arsenals. These are hardly controversial formulations, but the interesting thing is that the Althing takes the view that these objectives should be pursued on a mutual basis and in cooperation with international inspection and control bodies.

It also looks to have been a government objective to commit the opposition parties in the Althing to a joint statement on the important political question of nuclear-free zones in the Nordic area. And here it can appear as if the government has succeeded in achieving something. The declaration states that the Althing encourages the investigation of all possibilities and bases for a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, both on land and at sea, to reduce tension and limit arms.

But as far as the proposal for an isolated Nordic nuclear-free zone is concerned the Icelanders are clearer than many other groups in the Nordic area: Such a zone must at minimum also include the Baltic, the Norwegian Sea, and the Barents Sea, the declaration states, and consequently cover large sections of the Soviet Fleet. But in the Icelandic Government's view a nuclear-free zone should ideally stretch from Greenland to the Urals.

The great powers most closely affected, the United States and the Soviet Union, probably take a view somewhat different from that of the Icelandic Government on the question of nuclear-free zones and their size. And consequently, the zone issue, as it has been formulated, is not a matter of high priority in practical politics.

But even though the parties backed the Althing declaration the left-wing People's Alliance has already produced its own interpretation of the resolution. As a result it is unclear what the government has really achieved. According to the People's Alliance the most important thing about the declaration is that it states that no nuclear arms are stationed in Iceland. The party presents this as the beginning of a new development: a total and absolute absence of nuclear arms ("Western" understood) even in wartime.

It is special arrangements like this -- declared in advance -- that could alter Iceland's position within NATO. For the time being there is no danger that the People's Alliance will win support for its line -- the party is too weak for that -- but there are those who are working tirelessly in this direction.

CSO: 5200/2694

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

BRIEFS

TASS: JAPANESE CITY NFZ--Tokyo July 3 TASS--The city of Yamaguchi in the southwest of the island of Honshu, has been proclaimed a nuclear weapon-free zone. A resolution to this effect has been passed unanimously by the municipal council of that large city. Tokyo's decision to open the sea ports of the country to U.S. ships armed with cruise missiles gave a major impetus to the movement for the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones in Japan. By now five prefectures of the country and more than 500 cities and settlements were announced to be such zones. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0805 GMT 3 Jul 85]

CSO: 5200/1055

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

8 AUG 1985